

Also, a bill (H. R. 14011) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Berrysburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 14012) to provide for the retirement of officers in the Naval Reserve Force; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: Resolution (H. Res. 550) requesting the Department of Justice to investigate sugar hoarding in El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to Paul E. Slocumb Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, Bloomington, Ind., tents, cots, mattresses, pillows, and blankets for use at the State encampment to be held at said city May 25, 26, and 27, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14013) granting an increase of pension to Stanley S. Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 14014) granting an increase of pension to David W. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWOPE: A bill (H. R. 14015) for the relief of F. McKenzie Davison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 14016) granting a pension to John S. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 14017) granting a pension to Catherine Moody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 14018) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14019) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Linnehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3510. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of League of Women Voters, for Federal legislation on marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3511. Also (by request), petition of Congressional National Council, for constitutional amendment to give Congress power to enact uniform laws of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3512. Also (by request), petition of Brockton Post, No. 35, American Legion, favoring bonus plan for ex-soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3513. Also (by request), petition of department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, extending thanks for the passage of the Fuller pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3514. Also (by request), petition of General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Des Moines, Iowa, opposing all legislation favoring the recognition of the so-called republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3515. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of American Steamship Owners' Association of New York, favoring the same rank and pay for officers and men of the Coast Guard as are enjoyed by the officers and men of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3516. Also, petition of Italian Chamber of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Kenyon bill, Senate bill 3315, and opposing House bills 61, 563, and 8572; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3517. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Colson Clothing Co. and sundry citizens of Mendota, protesting against tax on articles of clothing made from the hides of horses and cattle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3518. Also, petition of F. W. Lennox, of Chicago, formerly major, United States Army, protesting against the exclusion of majors from the bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3519. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of board of aldermen, New York City, urging immediate legislation granting increased pay to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3520. Also petition of American Steamship Owners' Association, New York City, urging increased pay to Coast Guard Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3521. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Michigan Community Council Commission in favor of legislation to promote maternity and infant welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3522. Also petition of Martha Peters and 30 other members of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Oakland County, Mich., in favor of legislation to promote maternity and infant welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3523. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of William L. Kwedar, Halthorpe and Cahn Coblenz Co., Baltimore, both in the State of Maryland, regarding soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3524. Also, petition of L. Slesinger & Son, Baltimore, Md., regarding McNary bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3525. Also, petition of W. M. Dilsaver, John R. Sheridan, and A. H. Scanland, Liberty Lodge, all of Baltimore, Md., regarding House bill 12820; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3526. Also, petition of Maria Briscoe Croker, gold-star division, Baltimore, Md., regarding bringing home soldier dead; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3527. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of board of aldermen, city of New York, urging immediate legislation granting postal employees an increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3528. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Steamship Owners' Association, New York City, favoring increased pay to employees of Coast Guard Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3529. Also, petition of board of aldermen, of New York City, urging immediate legislation for increased pay of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3530. By Mr. SHREVE: Papers to accompany House bill 13992, granting a pension to Mary A. Crate; to the Committee on Pensions.

3531. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Maurice H. Powers, State secretary, Massachusetts State Letter Carriers' Association, Joseph L. Donovan, Mattapan post office employees, and post office clerks, mailing division, south postal station of Boston, Mass., asking for immediate action on report of postal wage commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3532. Also, petition of Mary Greene and Ellen Flint, of St. Paul, Minn., asking for report of Mason bill, House bill 3404, from committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3533. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Brockton Post No. 35, American Legion, Brockton, Mass., favoring a bonus for ex-service men and women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, May 10, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to the duty of this day out of the day set apart by action of Congress to commemorate the motherhood of this great land. We come with awakened memories of the precious days when heaven lay about us in our infancy, and of the continual care and toil and sacrifice that she gave us as she watched us develop to manhood, and the final blessing she gave us as she commissioned us with a mother's love to go into the world and stand for her honor, and her truth, and her God. We pray that we may erect in our lives monuments to the blessed mothers, and that by our high thinking and our clean living and our enthusiastic and united effort we may show ourselves worthy of this splendid heritage that we have received out of our mothers' love. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, May 7, 1920, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SPENCER. If there is no objection, I ask to have printed in the Record a petition relative to Senate bill 4267, concerning a commission to examine and report on the racial question. As time may afford in the future, I shall have something to say upon that bill. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, praying for the passage of bill (S. 4267) creating a commission on the racial question:*

We, the undersigned citizens, believing that the best interests of our country demand harmonious cooperation between all classes of its citizens, and that peace and prosperity can bless our land with substantial and lasting effects only when there is a perfect understanding and harmonious action between all classes of citizens, and when all

work together in unison for the common good of all; and, believing that the provisions of bill S. 4267, introduced by Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER, of Missouri, creating a commission on the racial question, if authorized by law, is calculated to quiet the unrest now prevalent throughout the country among a large class of our citizens, and to restore confidence and friendly feelings in the disturbed sections of the United States, and to bring about a more harmonious relation between white and colored Americans; and, believing that it is due the people of the entire country that steps be taken by national authority to handle the racial question as it would any other disturbing element in the body politic, do pray for the passage of the bill (S. 4267) creating a commission on the racial question.

JESSE LAWSON,  
President Frelinghuysen University and  
President National Sociological Society.  
(And others).

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of the Student Council of McPherson College, of McPherson, Kans., remonstrating against universal military training and praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Sunday school of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Manhattan, Kans., remonstrating against the use by the liquor interests of territory in China under the control of the United States Government for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a trans-Pacific news service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 4332) to exchange the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for a new site and building, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 581) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13576) authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, a certain building, or buildings, now located at Watertown, N. Y., reported it without amendment.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION.

Mr. SMOOT. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back to the Senate favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) to create a joint committee on the reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I desire to make just a brief statement as to the object of the joint resolution.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to hear it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That a joint committee is created, to be known as the joint committee on reorganization, which shall consist of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President thereof, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker thereof. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the joint committee on reorganization to make a survey of the administrative services of the Government for the purpose of securing all pertinent facts concerning their powers and duties, their distribution among the several executive departments, and their overlapping and duplication of authority; also to determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the several services, with a view to the proper correlation of the same, and what departmental regrouping of services should be made, so that each executive department shall embrace only services having close working relation with each other and ministering directly to the primary purpose for which the same are maintained and operated, to the end that there shall be achieved the largest possible measure of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government business.

SEC. 3. That the committee shall from time to time report to both the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its inquiries, together with its recommendations, and shall prepare and submit bills or resolutions having for their purpose the coordination of Government functions and their most efficient and economical conduct. The committee is authorized to employ such assistance as it may require, at such compensation as the committee may determine to be just and reasonable, and to make such reasonable expenditures as may be necessary for the proper conduct of its work, such expenditures to be paid in equal parts from the contingent funds of the House of Representatives and the Senate, as from time to time may be duly authorized by resolutions of those bodies.

SEC. 4. That the officers and employees of all administrative services of the Government shall furnish to the committee such information regarding powers, duties, activities, organization, and methods of business as the committee may from time to time require, and the committee or any of its employees, when duly authorized by the committee, shall have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any administrative service for the purpose of securing the information needed by the committee in the prosecution of its work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at the time I introduced the joint resolution I made a short statement to the representative of the New York Sun outlining its provisions. Perhaps it would be well for me at this time simply to repeat a part of that statement.

"The resolution provides that the committee shall 'make a survey of the administrative services of the Government for the purpose of securing all pertinent facts concerning their powers and duties, their distribution among the several executive departments, and their overlapping and duplication of authority.' The committee would also 'determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the several services, with a view to the proper correlation of the same, and what departmental regrouping of services should be made so that each executive department shall embrace only services having close working relations with each other to the end that there shall be achieved the largest possible measure of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government business.'

"The administrative branches of the Government have undergone no fundamental change since the organization was devised by Alexander Hamilton.

"No other government in the world could have gone on as ours has done and paid the bills involved in our wasteful methods of administration. We have been able to do it because this country has had resources and wealth unparalleled. But the war has brought us at last to realize that these will not last always, and that we must begin to adopt efficient administrative methods.

"We need a complete survey of the whole situation de novo by a committee of men willing to recognize that it is a task of day and night for a year, and very likely two years. There must be no politics in it, but merely a determination to get results. In my resolution I have not even suggested that the commission shall include representatives of both political parties, because I have wanted to leave the matter wide open for opportunity to appoint the men best equipped to do the work, regardless of party, and I would rather see the right men undertake it, even if they were all Democrats or all Republicans, than to see it intrusted to anybody else.

"There is endless duplication of work among different departments, and even in the same department. Can anybody give a possible reason why the Department of the Interior should be running an insane asylum, or why there should be 27 engineering organizations under our Government, or why the Government's efforts to encourage foreign commerce should be divided among the activities of four or five departments, perhaps more? It is the same through all the Government functions, and now when the burden of carrying our enormous debt is weighing on the people we can no longer neglect to give it consideration."

I think that succinctly states the object of the joint resolution. I recognize that it will take at least two years to make this report if the examination is made as it ought to be made, and there is no one who knows the least thing about the workings of our Government who will not immediately recognize that this work ought to be undertaken.

I therefore hope that the joint resolution will be put on its passage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I considered the pending joint resolution when it was before the committee and before it was reported to the Senate. I wish to say that I approve of the measure. I do not understand that it is introduced by way of criticism of anything which has taken place recently or in the distant past. The conflict of authority between the various bureaus of the Government and the duplication of work has not been deliberately done, but it has grown up through a period of years. That there is a vast duplication of work in the Government, that there is lost motion and lack of economy, can not be questioned, and I think an effort ought to be made to avoid duplication and to work toward greater economy in the Government.

Therefore, I favor the pending joint resolution. I think it will be a very difficult task for any committee to work out. It is a task that will meet with a great deal of conflict when the report is made. It does not commit Congress to any line of action, but merely expects to bring information for its future guidance.

I think it will cost a small amount of money, but the money will be well expended if after the committee is appointed it can bring to the two Houses of Congress information that will be



a guide to the future reorganization of the departments along economic lines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 19, after the word "conduct," insert the words "and the final report of said committee shall be submitted not later than the second Monday in December, 1922."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONATION OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC POST BUILDING IN BEDFORD, IOWA.

Mr. FERNALD. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9944) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by Sedgwick Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, of its memorial hall property in Bedford, Taylor County, Iowa, for Federal building purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the bill; it is such a wonderful bill and so unusual, in that it is asking for the opportunity to give something to the Government in these days when nearly everyone is trying to get something out of the Public Treasury.

This building at Bedford was built out of the pockets of the old soldiers of the Civil War. They have had a post there in days gone by of from 300 to 500 members. It has gone down now to about 25 members. This memorial hall which they constructed will make a good post-office building and save rent for the post office. These old soldiers desire to have it turned over to the Government as a contribution from them, which illustrates, I think, that the men who were willing to save the country then will have to save it in the days to come. It is such an unusual bill that I hope it will be passed by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by Sedgwick Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, of its memorial hall property in Bedford, Taylor County, Iowa, for Federal building purposes, being the east 29 feet of lot 8, block 11, original town of Bedford, at the southwest corner of Main and Water Streets, together with the two-story and basement building, 29 by 81 feet, outside measurement, now situated thereon; that said property shall be used and operated as are other public buildings, and that the annual appropriations for the general maintenance of public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department shall be construed to be available for use in connection with said property as for other buildings under said department.

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit said post and the Sedgwick Post Women's Relief Corps, No. 82, to continue to occupy the second floor of said building until such time as said post dissolves; such occupancy to be without charge for rent, water, heat, or light, which are to be included in such free use.

And that a suitable bronze tablet commemorative of this gift shall be furnished and placed on the exterior of said building at the expense of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Passed with thanks.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 4355) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a United States hospital in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4356) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Rawles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 4357) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4358) to provide allowances for mothers with children under 16 years of age dependent upon them for support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4359) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Princeton, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 4360) granting a pension to Abraham Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

VALUE OF COTTON CONTRACTS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, recently an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill, known as the Comer amendment, was adopted by the Senate, and the question is now in conference between the two Houses. I have had several letters on this subject of late, and I desire to submit one from the president of the Marine Bank & Trust Co., of New Orleans. I will read it:

MARINE BANK & TRUST CO.,

New Orleans, April 30, 1920.

HON. EDWARD J. GAY,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last week when I had the pleasure of traveling as far as Gulfport with you, you will recall that we discussed the Comer amendment, and I promised to send you some accurate information as to the possible workings of that amendment, if it became a law. I now hand you a memorandum which was given to me by one of the best-posted cotton men here, which I trust will be of use to you.

While I do not claim to be an expert on cotton matters, I do think that I know something about the markets of the world, as I am watching them all the time, and it is my conviction that further interference on the part of Congress in the matter of future delivery contracts will not be beneficial to the farmer, unless the last legislation which was passed, restricting deliveries, should be repealed, which I think would be probably a good thing. The freer the market, the better the price.

With kind regards,

Very truly, yours,

L. M. POOL, President.

This is the statement:

The Comer amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill is an ill-considered legislative proposal which would have a far-reaching injurious effect upon the entire cotton trade, from the producer to the ultimate consumer or user of the manufactured cotton products.

Serious economic legislation of this character should be given full and careful consideration and should not be railroaded through at the behest of political or private interests.

If the proponents of the Comer amendment were willing to have the light of intelligent reason and experience, or of intelligent understanding of their own interest, thrown upon the subject matter, they would not seek to have it jammed through as a rider on an important appropriation measure.

Mr. President, I want to say, in commenting, that I hold this matter is of too great importance to be railroaded through Congress as a rider upon any bill, and that as it is a subject affecting the cotton industry of this country it should be given hearings before the proper committees and legislation framed after everyone has had an opportunity to express his views. My interest is for the producer, the cotton farmer. Attaching this as a rider to an important bill—a bill which the country desires to have enacted into law, and one that can not now be agreed upon because of this amendment—I hope the conferees will recommend that the Senate recede from this amendment, so that we shall have an opportunity to finally pass the Agricultural appropriation bill, and that it may become a law.

The present future contract, which is the product of Federal legislation and which has the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture, limits the deliverable grades to those between middling fair at the top and low middling white at the bottom. All cotton deliverable under this contract is absolutely spinnable, although most of the spinners prefer to use grades from middling and above.

The Comer amendment provides that the buyer in the future contract shall have the right to demand that one-half of the delivery shall be middling and above and that the other half may, at the option of the seller, be of any grade or grades from middling fair to low middling white. The obvious purpose of this amendment is to insure the spinner who prefers to use middling and better grades that he can, by the purchase of a future contract on the rings of the exchanges, procure the delivery of 50 per cent of the grades that he prefers.

This mischievous and interested meddling with the complex machinery of the cotton trade would be harmful to the cotton producer, spinner, and merchant, and to the users of cotton goods for the following reasons:

The paramount value of the future contract is its "hedge" or protective value. It was never intended that such contract should take

the place of specific grade and staple contracts between the spinner and the merchant, and it can never become such substitute.

The future contract is used by the cotton trade as a policy of insurance against price fluctuations. The spinner desiring to contract ahead for his manufactured product and not having the stock in hand and probably not procurable except out of the crop not yet made or even planted, may so contract with impunity if he can go into the future market and protect himself against loss by the purchase of a hedge. When the actual supplies are needed he goes into the spot market and purchases the particular grade and staple required for his mill, and he thereupon closes out his protective contract or, in other words, cancels his price insurance policy.

The producer, satisfied with the prices prevailing in the future contract market, may sell against his crop, yet to be made and thus protect himself against declines in price. When his cotton is ready for market he sells the same on the basis of the grade and staple of the same, and thereupon closes out his hedge or, in other words, cancels his policy of price insurance.

The cotton merchant, or middleman between the producer and spinner, may contract with this spinner for specific grades and staples which he has not presently in hand, or he may buy the producer's crop, for which he has no present orders, provided that he can in the first case buy a future hedge, or, in the second place, sell the same, thereby insuring himself against price fluctuations. When he executes his spot contracts he sells or buys his hedges or, in other words, cancels his price insurance policy.

If either the spinner or merchant elects to take actual delivery on the future contracts when the same mature, they can use such grades and staples as may be under their needs or contracts usable, and the residue may be delivered on future contracts sold against the same.

This, in a general way, is the function of the future contract market to the non-speculative cotton trade. It gives the producer a broader market for his product, thereby enabling him to secure a better price, and it reduces the hazard to the manufacturer, thereby enabling him, if he chooses so to do, to reduce the price of the manufactured product to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. President, let me say that the question of this cotton contract has been considered by Congress for years and that the Government, through the Department of Agriculture, have formulated regulations which are printed in pamphlet form and which now govern the trading in cotton. The regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, under section 5 of the United States cotton-futures act, as amended March 4, 1899, have been given the best thought and should not be changed by any hasty legislation.

But who supply these future contracts? Who are the underwriters of this price insurance who issue the policies which protect the great non-speculative cotton trade in its forward business and commitments? Primarily the speculative element assumes this underwriting risk. The price optimist offers to buy and the price pessimist offers to sell. Thus the non-speculative trade procures its insurance.

In order that there may be both buyers and sellers it is necessary that the terms of the future contract must be fair to both and that it shall contain no pitfalls for either. If the terms of the contract unduly favor the seller, then the buyers will be frightened off, or if the said terms are unduly in the buyer's favor, then the sellers will be frightened off; in either case the future-contract market would be impaired, if not destroyed.

The Comer amendment makes the terms of the future contract too strong; i. e., it imposes an increased risk on the seller. The contract is narrow enough as it now stands. If the seller finds that he would be required to deliver cotton which he might not be able to obtain, he simply would not commit himself. The result would be that the future contract would be a skyrocketing speculative affair with no trade utility, and the future market as a trade agency would be impaired or destroyed. It is exactly as if legislation was enacted which made the risk too great upon the fire insurance underwriters. On paper the insured would be benefited, but as a matter of fact he would be destroyed, because the underwriters would not assume the risk.

The effect of the Comer amendment would be, therefore, if adopted, fundamental and far-reaching. It would throw a monkey wrench into the trade machinery by which cotton is financed, marketed, and distributed. It would result disastrously to the producer by depriving him and the buyers of his product of the hedge insurance protection, thus restricting his market, and it would result in benefit to no one except possibly the spinner, who, having driven out all competitors, could dictate the price of cotton.

Curiously enough the particular advantage which the spinners (of whom Senator COMER, the largest spinner in Alabama, is and always has been representative) expect to obtain from the said Comer amendment would prove to be a particular disadvantage.

In cases where the spinner has used the future contract bought at the rings of the exchanges as the medium of actual delivery, he has taken such grades as met with the particular requirements of his mill and has disposed of the balance by selling future contracts against the same and retendering on said contracts. Said spinners now think that under the Comer amendment they could, by demanding actual delivery, procure at least 50 per cent of the grades which they prefer. Now, suppose under the Comer amendment the spinner took up 1,000 bales on future contract, of which 50 per cent was middling and above, the grades which he preferred, and 50 per cent was low middling, which he did not desire to use. If he sold a future contract against the residue, he would have to go out into the market and buy 50 per cent of middling and above in order to be in a position to comply with the terms of the Comer amendment. He would therefore be just where he started from, and if the better grades happened to be scarce he would probably set up a great howl that he was being squeezed by Senator COMER's contract and that the future contract itself was a devilish piece of machinery designed for the purpose of robbing him of a modicum of the 200 per cent profit to which he has in recent years become accustomed.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the commissioner of agriculture of Louisiana, protesting against this proposed legislation, and also letters and telegrams from several other parties representing agricultural associations, protesting against the Comer amendment, which I ask to have inserted in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ASSOCIATION STATE FARMERS' UNION,  
PRESIDENTS OF FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL AND  
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,  
OFFICIAL HEADQUARTERS, NEW ORLEANS, LA.,  
Weatherford, Okla., April 28, 1920.

Senator E. J. GAY,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The more our people find out about the Comer amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill the more they oppose it, for it will sure knock the farmer out on low-grade cotton, and it is not the farmers' fault that wind and rains turn cotton from good grades to low grades. We want the Agricultural appropriation bill, but we don't want the Comer rider, and we ask you and the Members of Congress to take off that Comer rider and let a separate bill be filed and let a full hearing be granted before it becomes a law. It strikes me this would be the fair way to do this, to give everybody a chance to be heard.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN A. SIMPSON, President.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C.

Hon. E. J. GAY,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The amendment offered by Senator COMER to the Agricultural appropriation bill enters so vitally into the business life of the Nation and is so far-reaching in its effect that, in my judgment, it would be only fair that the great interests involved should have ample time and opportunity to thoroughly study and discuss with the interested parties and the Members of Congress this matter in the fullest way. Therefore I believe that Senator COMER's amendment should not be adopted as an amendment, but that, if he desires, it be offered as a bill and take the regular course and not be attached to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which it is desirable should be passed at an early day. I am,

Sincerely, yours,

GRAY SILVER,  
Washington Representative  
American Farm Bureau Federation.

NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,  
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1920.

Hon. EDWARD J. GAY,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It has come to our knowledge that there is a wide difference of opinion among the cotton growers as to the Comer amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill, and because of the great importance of the matter I believe it should have a full and fair hearing before being enacted into law.

I therefore trust the bill will be reported without the Comer amendment.

Very truly, yours,

T. C. ATKESON,  
Washington Representative.

BATON ROUGE, LA., March 30, 1920.

Hon. E. J. GAY,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

We think Comer amendment is detrimental to cotton growers. You and RANDELL please confer with Senator SMITH of South Carolina at once.

HARRY D. WILSON,  
Commissioner.

MANY, LA., March 28, 1920.

Hon. E. J. GAY,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Kill the Comer rider to the Agriculture appropriation bill, as it outlaws the majority of the cotton raised by farmers and destroys price insurance.

I. N. MCCOLLISTER,  
President Louisiana Farmers' Union.

GONZALES, LA., March 30, 1920.

Senator EDWARD J. GAY,  
Washington, D. C.

The rider to the Agriculture appropriation bill by COMER, if permitted to become law, would so restrict the contract as to be a vital blow to its usefulness to the producers, sellers, and buyers of American cotton. Briefly, the Comer rider is in the interest of the cotton spinner and opposed to the cotton producers, and if incorporated as the law would mean a death blow to the cotton producers. I hope you will do all in your power to eliminate this Comer rider entirely. The passage of the Comer rider would place the American farmer at the mercy of the American spinners and foreign manufacturers, as they would control the price of American cotton.

H. ARTHUR MORGAN,  
Secretary-Treasurer Association State Farmers' Union Presidents.

#### CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, on May 6 last a resolution was introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] contemplating an inquiry by the Committee on Privileges and Elections as to contributions to the campaigns of candidates for nomination for President of the United States. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Washington Post this morning contains an article entitled "Big G. O. P. War Chest," which is written by Mr. George Rothwell Brown, one of the staff of the Post, from which I read as follows:

Encouraging reports to Republicans have become available with respect to campaign finances. The campaign fund this year will reach a most interesting figure, and if it should touch the \$10,000,000 mark it would not be surprising. \* \* \*



The collection agency of the Republican Party has been organized with thoroughness.

It covers every State and every county. Every State has been assessed its quota of money. In some States, if not all, the apportionment has been based on the Liberty loan subscriptions, and some of the Western States have already gone over the top.

The ways and means committee is composed of National Committee-men T. Coleman du Pont, the Delaware millionaire; James M. McGraw, the millionaire oil and lumber man, of Oklahoma; and CAMPBELL SLEMP, of Virginia; and, in addition, William Boyce Thompson, the New York millionaire; William Cooper Procter, the Cincinnati millionaire; and former Senator John W. Weeks, of Boston.

Only the most credulous, I judge, will cling to the theory that subscriptions to the Republican campaign fund are to be limited to \$1,000 each, which has been officially advanced, but which is shot full of holes in private conversations. In fact, the crusade spirit is unmistakably abroad in the country, and the people are showing unusual willingness to contribute to the fund. I am told that those who formerly gave \$50 and \$100 in presidential years have been "coming across" with donations of \$500 and \$1,000.

I respectfully call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] to the circumstance that Mr. T. Coleman du Pont is the chairman of this finance committee, which it is expected will raise a fund of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of electing a Republican President.

Mr. THOMAS. I trust the Senator from Montana will also call the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to this remarkable piece of news. If the Senator from Montana will permit me for a moment, I may say that this is a situation which I anticipated when I prepared and introduced a pending amendment to the antidumping bill, intending to impose an income tax of 50 per cent upon all such contributions in excess of \$1,000. If the Senate will only enact that provision into law, possibly, upon the principle that nothing is wholly bad, we may be able to get a very respectable revenue for the Government through the process.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that the article in the Post to which I have referred be submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration in connection with the resolution to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] or any other Senator should think there is any truth in the newspaper report from which the Senator from Montana has read. It is written by Mr. Brown; it is sensational in character; and no one thinks that there are going to be \$10,000,000 collected for the next Republican campaign. I do not believe that even the Democratic Party can collect that amount of money for the coming campaign, with all the power that they have for enforcing contributions, which, no doubt, they will undertake to exercise.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to say that in view of some developments of the immediate past if the Democratic Party is able to raise a million dollars I shall be very much surprised; but let me say to the Senator, with regard to this article, that it appears in a Republican paper—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; it is not a Republican paper.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; it is. It does not call itself Republican, but it does not have to do so, for anybody who reads it knows what its politics is. It identifies certain millionaires in the United States who are prominent in the Republican Party, one of whom has been managing the candidacy of a very prominent and conspicuous candidate, and another of whom is a delegate at large from the great State of New York to the Republican national convention.

I hope this report is not true. Ten million dollars, Mr. President, in these days does not appeal to Senators of the experience of my friend from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and myself as very large; it is "chicken feed" in these days, and compared to the extravagance of the country, as evidenced by the expenditure of a hundred million dollars a month in New York for candy, as announced by the New York Times yesterday, it is, after all, not surprising. I may be overcredulous, but I am inclined to think that there is something behind it. At least, I hope the Senator from Idaho will direct the energies of his investigation toward that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. I think at the same time the attention of the Senator from Idaho ought to be called to the fact that there are several millionaires in the United States who are very active at present directing the campaign of Democratic aspirants for the presidential nomination.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true—

Mr. SMOOT. And I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that, as between the millionaires mentioned in the article to which reference has been made and the millionaires of New York having the campaign of Mr. McAdoo in hand, give me the millionaires of New York for money-raising ability, because I

think that Mr. Barney Baruch and Mr. Chadbourne can raise \$10 where any one of the men mentioned in the newspaper article can raise \$1.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be so; I am not so familiar with millionaires as is my friend from Utah; but this matter should not be set aside by merely having the pot call the kettle black. If contributions are being made in these enormous amounts, I do not care whether they are made for Democratic candidates or for Republican candidates, it is wrong, and we should impose an income tax upon the men who spend these prodigious sums for corrupting the conscience and the political virtue of the Nation.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, the Senator makes a statement, of course, that anyone, perhaps, can agree to, that it is wrong to raise \$10,000,000 for any campaign.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says "anyone perhaps can agree" to it. Does not the Senator agree to it without the "perhaps"?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; but I did not want to speak for everybody, and that is why I used the word "perhaps."

Mr. THOMAS. Why not?

Mr. SMOOT. Because there are people in the United States who may not think it is wrong, and I do not want to say for them that it is positively wrong. Personally I think it is, and I do not believe that it will be done.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any such idea, and it seems to me almost a waste of time to call attention to this question based upon a newspaper report. I have not any doubt that both parties will use a great deal of money in the campaign—

Mr. THOMAS. More than they should.

Mr. SMOOT. But I wish to say now that as between the two parties I know the Democratic Party is in a better position to request, if not to demand, contributions than is the Republican Party.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. What the Senator from Utah says may be so; I do not intend to pass upon it; I do not know; but I shall not defend my party upon the theory that, because the millionaires of the other party propose to do these things, therefore we should do them. I think such action should be prohibited and punished, and when a Democrat violates the principle he is equally guilty with a Republican who violates it.

Mr. SMOOT. I was not offering any excuse whatever for the rumor that the Republican Party was going to collect \$10,000,000 for the coming fall campaign. I simply rose to say that I do not believe there is a word of truth in the article read, and I think it is perfect nonsense to call attention of the Senate to an article written by Mr. Brown in which he gives an expression of opinion concerning a matter that he does not know anything about.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think it is perfectly apparent to anyone who has observed political conditions for the last six months that there is a very powerful organization in both parties which has come to the conclusion that the really dominating and controlling principle in American politics is that of money. There is nothing to be gained by either party undertaking to cover up the fact that there is a powerful element in both parties who believe in that proposition. Whether or not they constitute a majority in either party I do not know, but there are too many in both parties. The masses of the American people on both sides of the political fence are just as much opposed to that kind of practice as they ever were, and the thing which devolves upon us to do is to expose the coterie of profiteers and multimillionaires who have lost all sense of decency, and who propose if they can to control the conventions and the presidential election through the sheer use of money and let the American people take care of the situation. They will do so when they get to the polls. That is the best way to take care of the matter.

Mr. President, a few days ago I offered a resolution calling for an investigation of campaign expenditures, concerning which I wish to say a word in no sense reflecting upon the committee, for I state in all sincerity that I do not reflect upon it. It is pretty difficult to get a majority of any committee in session now owing to the absence of so many Senators. Therefore, without intending to reflect upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and for the reason that it is difficult to get a majority of the committee assembled, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate resolution 357 and that it be brought to the floor of the Senate in order

that I may have it referred where it has to go in any event, namely, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections is discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BORAH. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HIGH COST OF LIVING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CAPPER. I offer a resolution directing the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia to the advance in the price of bread in the District of Columbia. I should like to have unanimous consent to have it read and considered at this time. I do not believe there will be any objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 358) was read, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that there is to be an increase in the price of bread in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas such increase will place an additional living cost burden upon the people of the District which a great many citizens believe is unwarranted at this time and out of harmony with the Nation-wide effort that is being made to stabilize prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, directed to inquire into the facts as to the proposed increase in the price of bread and make such recommendations as the situation warrants.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I offer this resolution because at the hearings conducted last July and August by the Special Committee on High Cost of Living appointed from the District of Columbia Committee information and facts were brought out which convinced me that there is absolutely no warrant for this proposed increase in the price of bread to-day. The committee gave special attention to the bread situation, as to the cost of bread and the prices prevailing at that time, and it brought out some very interesting facts.

That hearing showed, for one thing, that the chief of the profiteers in the city of Washington was a man by the name of Corby, engaged in the bread-making business; that he sold about one-half of all the bread baked and consumed by the Washington public. It showed that he had in a very few years become a millionaire. The committee required him to bring his books before it, and the figures are rather interesting. I think you will be interested in them at this time, because of the attempt at this time to hike the price of bread.

They showed that Corby had made net profits in the year 1918 at one of his bakeries—he has two large bakeries—of \$294,059, after allowing himself a salary of \$25,000. He has another bakery which at the same time made him \$19,000 net profit, after allowing him another salary for the same year of \$5,000. Including both bakeries and the salary allowed himself, Corby's profits on one year's baking business, the year 1918, amounted to about one-third of a million dollars. You will find all this on page 604 of the very interesting report of these hearings conducted by the District of Columbia Committee.

According to this testimony taken by the committee, Corby's profits have been steadily and rapidly increasing. In 1914, the year before the war, his largest bakery made \$44,063 profit. This increased in 1915 to \$59,294; in 1916 to \$87,370; in 1917 to \$142,202; and in 1918 to \$294,059.

According to the information which came to our committee, his profits were equally large in 1919. In fact, they were increasing during the first half of 1919.

While we are on this subject of profiteering in Washington, let me say that coming up Pennsylvania Avenue this morning, I noticed a pair of shoes in one of the leading stores marked at \$18.50. In this connection, it might be interesting now to know what this same report from the District of Columbia Committee shows as to the profits of a few shoe dealers.

Rich & Sons filed a statement with the committee, and you will find it on page 972 of this report, which showed that their net profits jumped from \$2,044 in 1914 to \$18,000 in 1917, and then to \$64,743 in 1918, with every indication that since then the profits have been fully as large. This net profit of \$64,000 in 1918 was made after each member of the firm had taken out a salary of \$6,500. The total capital invested at that time was \$111,924, according to their statement, on which the net profit in one year was \$64,000, and the profits were increasing when the report was made to our committee.

Another shoe firm, William Hahn & Co., made a net profit of \$38,819 in 1916, \$40,807 in 1917, and \$54,954 in 1918.

The report filed by Snyder & Little showed that their net profits jumped from \$7,429 in 1916 to \$11,773 in 1917, and then

to \$30,000 in 1918; and in all these cases the prices and profits were increasing during the year 1919, although our investigation, of course, concluded in July of last year.

Profiteering now seems to be rampant all over the country, but I think the price gouger has a little tighter grip on the city of Washington than any other city that I know of. It has become so shameless that the profiteers take advantage even of Mother's Day to hold up the public. Here yesterday they were holding up the people all over this city for 25 cents for a little carnation, selling them even in quantities in most of the leading florists' shops here for \$3 a dozen on Mother's Day, an increase of some 400 or 500 per cent, because of the fact that there was an unusual demand for them.

So I say the profiteering spirit seems to be rampant in the Nation's Capitol, and it is no wonder that the people here are complaining. There are thousands of Government clerks here who are trying to support a family on \$1,200 a year while necessities of life are going higher. The people have reached the limit, and a demand now of 17 per cent increase in the price of bread, amounting to about \$2,000,000 a year that will be exacted from the consuming public of Washington, is unreasonable and in my opinion there is no basis for it.

For that reason, I think the Committee on the District of Columbia ought to be authorized to investigate the latest move on the part of the bakers.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPPER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Did the Senator reach the conclusion, from the investigation which he made, that most of the profiteering was by the retailer rather than the wholesaler?

Mr. CAPPER. So far as the city of Washington is concerned, we found there was general profiteering in this city in almost all lines of business.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which he is a member and I am also a member, should take up the question of licensing the various retail as well as wholesale establishments in this District, and have some provision in the ordinance that if they are engaged as monopolies, or charging extortionate prices, a license shall be denied them?

Let me say to the Senator that a committee waited upon me on Friday asking that an ordinance be passed dealing with the question of the hotels. They called attention to the immense dividends made by the Willard and the Raleigh and other hotels in this city, and asked that an ordinance be passed that would fix the prices to be charged by the hotel keepers of the District.

It is very clear that the District has the power to license innkeepers and hotelkeepers; and I think the committee, when they consider the Senator's resolution, should also formulate a law that will attack these profiteering landlords and hotelkeepers and eatinghouse keepers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the committee considered that phase of the subject carefully; but just about the time the committee concluded its investigation the information came to us that the Department of Justice was going to take hold of the situation here in Washington in a vigorous way, appoint a fair-price organization, and do something to improve conditions. It seems to me, however, that the condition is getting worse instead of better; and especially now, when they are asking an increase of 17 per cent in the price of bread, when the leading baker of the city, to the knowledge of this committee, cleaned up something like a third of a million dollars in one year, I think it is time for Congress to enter protest. For that reason I ask that this resolution have immediate consideration.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, may I ask him if the committee investigated in any manner the question of the profits of the meat dealers?

Mr. CAPPER. The committee did investigate that question and they showed that the profiteering to a very great extent was on the part of the retail dealers.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the Senator if he knows whether there is any law on the statute books at the present time, or any ordinance of the city of Washington, which compels full measure and full weight, and whether there is any inspection system providing a penalty against fraud upon the public for underweight and undermeasure?

Mr. CAPPER. I have not any information on that subject.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CAPPER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. A resolution was offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] some time ago about the increase in car fare. My recollection is that it went to the Committee on



the District of Columbia. What has been done about that resolution? That shows a greater increase, I think, than 17 per cent.

Mr. CAPPER. It does; and I think that is unwarranted.

Mr. HARRISON. What has been done with that resolution?

Mr. CAPPER. There has been no action taken by the committee, so far as I know.

Mr. HARRISON. I think something should be done, if possible.

Mr. CAPPER. I think so myself.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether the committee found any evidence of any prosecutions for profiteering here in the District of Columbia, either under Federal laws or under the laws of the District?

Mr. CAPPER. No; we had no information of that kind. As a matter of fact, the Department of Justice had done little or nothing here in the city of Washington until this committee took up the subject, but they started in immediately upon a system of prosecution or of regulating the matter in this District. It does not seem to me, however, that they have made much progress.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question. I have been busy in attendance on a committee this morning, and I was therefore unable to be present, and the Senator may have covered the question I am going to ask. If so, I shall not ask him to repeat his answer.

We have in this city a large number of what are called public markets. Has the Senator investigated those markets with reference to their prices?

Mr. CAPPER. The Senator refers to the Center Market?

Mr. REED. Yes; there is the Center Market, and there are other so-called public markets.

Mr. CAPPER. The committee did investigate them. It went into the matter very carefully, and had a number of these dealers before the committee, and the investigation showed that most of them were making unusual and I think excessive profits.

Mr. REED. How are those markets run? Does the Government merely own the building and rent the stalls without any regulation at all, or what is the arrangement?

Mr. CAPPER. The building is owned by a market company, and the stalls are leased by this market company. They are under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; that is, whatever regulation or supervision there is comes from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REED. I can hardly hear the Senator. The buildings are owned by companies, not by the Government, and these companies rent stalls. Is that the situation?

Mr. CAPPER. That is the situation.

Mr. REED. Nevertheless they are known as public markets?

Mr. CAPPER. They are.

Mr. REED. Does the Government have any officer to supervise the business of these stalls, to see that it is conducted in a fair manner?

Mr. CAPPER. The city of Washington has a market master, who is supposed to be responsible for everything going on at the Center Market.

Mr. REED. Does he undertake in any way to regulate the prices?

Mr. CAPPER. No, sir.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator think that if we are to regulate prices we could well begin with the public markets established under the control of the District?

Mr. CAPPER. The matter of prices in this District seems to be under the direction of the Department of Justice, with an organization selected by the Attorney General and his fair price committee. They are supposed to take notice of all wrongdoing in that direction.

Mr. REED. That applies to the whole District?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes, sir; and to the markets.

Mr. REED. It has been utterly impotent.

Mr. CAPPER. It applies also to the Center Market.

Mr. REED. The question I am asking applies to a different matter, and I can make my question plain perhaps by an illustration. In many cities of the country, for the benefit of the public, and in order to have a place where goods will be sold at moderate prices, there are established public markets, in many instances the municipality itself owning the building and renting the stalls, and a market master is placed in charge, whose business it is to see that the transactions are of a fair character, that the foods which are sold are wholesome, and so forth.

It seems to me that if we are to talk about any regulation of prices in the District of Columbia we ought to begin by the establishment of something that is in fact a public market, where goods are sold in the public market, under public super-

vision, at a reasonable price. If you go beyond that and go into the private institutions and begin the regulation there in times of peace, I do not know where you are going to stop.

If the principle is sound in the District of Columbia, it must then be sound in every other part of the United States, and if the Government undertakes the regulation of all prices everywhere, we will, of course, have set aside the law of supply and demand and substitute Government control. That is an entirely different proposition from regulating prices in a publicly owned and publicly controlled market.

As I understand the Senator, there is no real regulation of the markets in this city?

Mr. CAPPER. Not so far as the regulation of the prices is concerned; but there is a market master, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who has authority to see that the market is properly conducted.

Mr. REED. That is, properly conducted along the lines of being clean, decent, and so forth?

Mr. CAPPER. Exactly.

Mr. REED. But no regulation of prices or of profits?

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all.

Mr. REED. Just one more question. Is the Senator prepared to embark upon a policy of the Government fixing the prices of all products, either National or State?

Mr. CAPPER. I think we now have law sufficient to warrant the Department of Justice in proceeding against any man who is exacting an unfair and unreasonable profit, and to that extent we can determine or fix the prices, and insist upon a reasonable price.

Mr. REED. That, of course, is not an answer to my question. I am curious to know whether the Republican Party or the Democratic Party is prepared in this country, in time of peace, to embark upon the policy of the Government regulating prices of all the necessities of life. If so, of course, it will involve the fixing of the price of labor, the fixing of the price of farm products, the fixing of every charge entering into the ultimate price.

While I may be speaking on a very unpopular side of the question, while I know that the people are suffering because of very high prices at the present time, I am not yet prepared to plunge into the sea of either socialism or communism. Those are exactly the waters we will enter when we begin the business, in time of peace, of regulating prices, for you can not regulate the price of one article with any justice unless you regulate the price of the constituent articles entering into it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just one second. Neither can you get at the constituent elements of the cost unless you take labor, capital, and all the various products, and you can not regulate the price of one article with justice to the producer of that article unless you extend your scheme of regulation to cover all articles. So if we are to embark on this ocean, it will be well to do it after some careful thought. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if such a policy could be even remotely successful unless we also undertook to regulate production and transportation?

Mr. REED. Undoubtedly you have to embrace everything. If you start with the question of the cost of bread, if you are to regulate the price of bread, you can not do it successfully unless you begin by regulating the price of wheat, the profits of the miller, the cost of transportation, the cost of warehousing, the wages of the baker—

Mr. THOMAS. Right there, Mr. President, let me suggest that there is at present an apt illustration of the truth of the Senator's statement appearing in the morning papers, the announcement being the rise in the price of loaves of bread of 2 cents per loaf, due to the advance of wages to the bakers who threatened to strike the other day and were prevented from doing so by a practical yielding to their demands. In other words, if we consume in the District of Columbia 200,000 loaves of bread per day, the people pay \$4,000 a day because of that advance, and any attempted regulation of the price of bread will necessarily have to regulate the price of labor in its production, because otherwise, as is the case, and as is always the case, it is passed right on to the consumer, who pays now an additional price for bread alone in this District of \$120,000 a year as a result of the settlement of that strike.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at the risk of repeating arguments I have made before, I feel like calling attention for just a moment to some fundamentals which we in the Senate must not overlook.

One of those fundamentals is that when you interfere with business you must be very careful lest you stop the expansion of business and lest the effect of your act is not exactly the converse of what you desire. The great fundamental trouble

in the world to-day—and it is admitted by every intelligent man—is that there is an immense gap between production and consumption. That was occasioned by a cause so great that it has touched every quarter of the earth. Twenty-five million men were taken from industrial and productive activities and put upon the field of battle for substantially five years, and every man, woman, and child in the United States, to a greater or less extent, employed their energies in producing the materials for the sustaining of the Great War. The result is a shortage of everything, a shortage of railway facilities, a shortage of ships upon the sea, a shortage of machinery in mills, a shortage of labor, and a shortage in everything due to destruction and failure to produce. Until that shortage is made up there will be a keen market, and that market will be aggravated, of course, by all those speculative practices and tendencies which come under such conditions.

Among these shortages there is a shortage of houses. Let us assume that we undertake to remedy the shortage of housing by a regulation of rents, and let us practically apply that experiment, and see how it will work out. There is a shortage of houses, rents mount high, and building costs have also mounted very high. Everything entering into a new house costs approximately twice as much as it did before the war, and even more than that. But there is a shortage of housing. A man desires to build a house and figures at present rents that he can build a great apartment house, which will cost him \$2,000,000, which formerly would have cost a million, but that at the present rents he can build the house and pay the \$2,000,000 and still make money.

At about the time he is ready to break ground, he is informed by his lawyer that Congress has appointed a man to fix those rents for him. He does not know at what figure that man will fix the rents. What sensible man would build an apartment house under those circumstances and embark his fortune in that venture? What sensible loan company would lend any considerable amount of money with which to build property under those circumstances? The result is that the apartment house is not built. The result is that the dearth of houses continues, and rents will continue to advance unless held down by some arbitrary act of government. But the longer you hold them down, and the more you aggravate the shortage, the worse the result will be in the end.

I grant you that the profiteer, the—I do not like to use the term—the rent hog, and men of that kind ought to be controlled if they can be controlled. But it is a serious question in my mind whether in the end we will not be forced merely to allow the law of supply and demand to take its course, confident of the fact that we will soon reach a point where prices will become so high that they will become prohibitive that consumption will be reduced, that the gap between production and consumption will thereupon be filled, and that the prices will come down by natural causes. If the men and women of the United States could be persuaded not to buy a new suit of clothes or a new dress for six months, not to go through this silly performance of wearing overalls, but to wear their old clothes, there would be a surplus of dress goods and of suitings in the United States at the end of six months and the prices would go down.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of the operation of the law of supply and demand. The trouble is that the law of supply and demand has been controlled in this country and is no longer permitted to operate by reason of the fact that a certain limited number of individuals have obtained control of the necessities of life and have repealed, as it were, the law of supply and demand.

Mr. REED. The Senator refers to great trusts and combinations?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator spoke of it, because there is no man on the floor of the Senate who has inveighed against them oftener than I have, or who is more wedded to the doctrine that every combination ought to be punished and that every monopoly ought to be dissolved. I hesitate to say a word of criticism of the Supreme Court, but I confess that when I find the Supreme Court of the United States can ratify and confirm the Steel Trust combination and do it upon the ground that it seems to be necessary to let it live, the way I read its opinion, when nearly all trust prosecutions have ceased in the country, I look with a good deal of dismay at that phase of the situation, unless we can get a Congress that will reenact the antitrust acts in such a form that they mean something and force action, unless we can some day get an Attorney General who can look a \$100,000,000 combination in the face without fainting. The truth is that the laws of Congress have been nullified by the action of Attorneys General and by the action—

I am sorry to say—of courts. I dislike to criticize the courts. I have never done so except upon the rarest occasion.

Mr. President, this morning passed through my hands in the newsprint hearing the indictment filed against the newsprint paper combination, and the pleas of nolo contendere of these great concerns, enormously capitalized, one of them I recall at \$45,000,000. They were fined in the aggregate upon pleas of nolo contendere \$11,000, and that was done by the consent of the Attorney General of United States. Eleven thousand dollars was not as much to one of those corporations as the smallest marble that a schoolboy ever carried in his store was to him.

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly, however, they promised never to do it again.

Mr. REED. Let me tell you what they promised. Then the Attorney General fixed up an agreement with them in advance, by the terms of which he was to file a suit in equity, and when the suit in equity was filed they were to confess judgment, and when the judgment was confessed the decree was to be written that during the war and for a period of three months thereafter they would sell their paper at a price fixed by the Federal Trade Commission, with the right on the part of the company to appeal from the decision of the Federal Trade Commission to the United States Circuit Court of New York. But the decree contained a further clause that they did not have to sell at that price provided they could make and did make contracts with purchasers at another and different price.

The practical working out of it was that although the Federal Trade Commission's price, plus the raise made by the United States court, was at the highest point, 3.7525 cents per pound, every great newspaper in the United States closed contracts with the concerns by which they paid a price that was to be fixed by the company to them and readjusted by the company every three months, with the right on their part to refuse to take the paper if they wanted to, and thus go without any paper.

So acute was the situation and in such danger did the great newspapers of the country find themselves that they contracted for 110 per cent of the product of the greatest of these mills—that is, for 10 per cent more than it could produce, and at prices ranging as high as 5 cents a pound, while the public price fixed was 3.7525 cents. In other words, the effect of the decree was absolutely nullified, and the newspapers were left just where they were before the decree was entered.

I desire to say nothing harsh of institutions engaged in business, but a trust act which provides the pains and penalties of the penitentiary, and which is reduced to a mere farce by a fine of \$11,000 on an institution of that kind, ceases to be a law, because it has been nullified by the governmental authorities themselves. As long as we have that kind of enforcement of law against the great offenders of this country, and a keen and shrewd enforcement of the law against the individual who is poor and helpless, we will have discontent in the country and disgust with the Government.

It is time these performances were stopped. They were begun by Wickersham. They have been continued under Palmer and under his predecessor, Mr. Gregory. The time for the executive department of the Government to cease disregarding the statutes of the land has come. The time to carry out the laws of the land according to their letter and their spirit has arrived. Either that will be done, or the country will be pushed into the dangerous experiment of governmental regulation of everything. There must either be an open market for the law of supply and demand to operate or there will be a governmental control, and I sincerely hope we will never be driven to the last alternative.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, before the resolution is agreed to, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment.

Bread is made from flour, and flour is made from wheat and other cereals. Of course, it will be at once claimed that the producer is profiteering. To show that this is not the case, I wish to have read at the desk a letter from Mr. Sam W. Teagarden, of Great Falls, Mont., a short letter addressed to me, and then a letter offering some criticism of Mr. Hoover, who seems to be able to control the prices of wheat to the farmer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., April 27, 1920.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inasmuch as various eulogists of former Food Administrator Herbert A. Hoover have read into the permanent records of the Congress, I ask the honorable Senate,



through you, to allow to go into the same RECORD a differing estimate upon the record of Mr. Hoover as Food Administrator.

Not only am I a native-born American, but my great grandparents on both sides in the family line were American born. I am also a farmer, and have for many years been active in farm-organization work. I believe that millions of American farm men and women will indorse the discussion for which I request a place in the RECORD.

Sincerely, yours,

SAM W. TEAGARDEN.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., April 12, 1920.

Because during a five months' stay in Washington while the Gore amendment to increase the wheat price was pending, and to assist in the passage of which I was sent by the Congress of Montana Farmers' Organizations, I made a careful study of Hoover's conduct as Food Administrator, which study I also maintained until the close of his administration. I do not hesitate to say that his nomination for President, by whatsoever party, would be deeply resented in the homes of the millions of farm men and women of the Nation, whom he grossly betrayed to the whole brood of profiteers included in the Packers' Trust, the Milling Trust, the Milk Condensery Trust, and the prepared-food combines.

More than that, Hoover's nomination by the Republican Party—the party whose birth was in the farmer States and whose lease of power was strongest and most lasting when it commanded the vote of the farmers as a class—would be an unforgivable outrage and a tragedy to the party from which it might well take years to recover.

The day Hoover was named as Food Administrator the price of No. 1 northern wheat on the Chicago market was \$3.05. He at once inaugurated a sustained campaign of misrepresentation to break down the high price of wheat. Through the press he conducted the greatest "bear" raid on wheat ever carried on in the history of the Nation; indeed, his campaign exceeded in effectiveness in reducing the wheat price the greatest of all the bear raids ever carried out by grain gamblers of the great exchanges of the country.

As a result, the final work of the commission appointed to fix a minimum price of wheat resulted in 85 cents per bushel under the price at the time of Hoover's appointment. And at that the price fixed by the commission was 30 cents per bushel higher than the price Hoover sought to force the commission to make.

To heighten his offensive against the wheat farmer, Hoover foisted upon President Wilson a set of differential prices at the various terminal markets that was designed solely to put, and did so put, all the big mills of the country on an even basis of profit making, and in utter and brutally unfair disregard of the economic rights of the wheat farmers. Our Government and the allied Governments bought flour on the basis of the wheat price fixed for New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, the flour to be delivered at those terminals. Interior mills paid so much less per bushel for wheat that they could pay the freight on the flour to those eastern terminals and still make a per barrel profit identical with those eastern mills. That freight was in actual effect paid by the farmers who grew the wheat for the interior mills.

The wheat farmers protested to Hoover and to the President, but in vain.

This economic outrage was made possible because Hoover, in defiance of the purpose of the Congress, so unlawfully manipulated his powers as to make the minimum wheat price also the maximum price.

The farmers lost profits in tens of millions of dollars. The American millers and the treasuries of England, France, Italy, and Belgium profited by the amounts the wheat farmers of this country lost.

Again, Hoover sent two of the country's big men—Gifford Pinchot and Ed. C. Lassater, of the American Live Stock Association—out to the corn-belt States to urge the farmers to put more fat on their hogs. The farmers responded, but when the fat hogs came on the packers' markets they were promptly penalized 25 cents per hundred pounds because they were over-fat. Pinchot and Lassater protested to Hoover in person, as did representatives of the hog producers. Lassater presented his written resignation to Hoover in person, saying in that document: "I do not intend to be used by you to rob the hog-growing farmers in the interest of the Packers' Trust." Pinchot also resigned.

But Hoover sustained the packers. And the packers in consequence gained the millions of dollars the farmers lost in the crooked transaction.

And, more, Hoover allowed the packers a profit of 9 per cent on meat products and 15 per cent on by-products, based on all

the money they had in the business and all they borrowed from time to time. The Federal Trade Commission protested this gross favoritism, but in vain, as were a storm of other protests. To further fatten packer profits, Hoover allowed them to charge as manufacturing costs all interest on borrowed money above 5 per cent. The packers borrowed from themselves as bankers in huge sums at 6½ and 7 per cent and charged the difference up to the Government and the public as "costs."

Is it a matter of wonder that J. Ogden Armour, from his seat of power as a member of the National Council of Defense, was for Hoover's appointment as Food Administrator and sustained Hoover during the war with all the power of the packers—financial, political, and otherwise?

Hoover also handed the milk producers of the country a jolt. He put the milk condensaries under license and cunningly arranged them into districts. He fixed no maximum price for condensed milk to the Government or the consumers, but he put the milk-producing farmers at the mercy of the condensers' combine by requiring each of them to certify as follows under oath:

This condensary hereby certifies that it has not during the preceding week paid a higher price for milk than any other condensary in its district.

With this air-tight monopoly on the throats of the milk producers, and no maximum on the condensaries' products, these concerns exported during the year 1918 the huge sum of \$82,000,000 worth. They sold to the American public as much more.

Some fat thing, that, for the milk condensaries combine! Like the hog growers with the packers, the trust profited by the tens of millions filched by Hoover's connivance from the farmers.

By the way, and lest I omit reference to it, Hoover pulled another stunt aimed at the hog growers. He sent E. Dana Durand out to Chicago, to raid the corn and hog price. Durand gave out interviews to the Chicago papers and to the Associated Press, predicting a return to \$1 corn and \$10 hogs. The uproar that went up from the farmers and the agricultural press compelled Hoover to lay down. But his intentions were good to break down the price of hogs for the benefit of the treasuries of the foreign Governments that had sent him over here and had wished him onto the American people by the most extensive and cunningly concealed propaganda ever carried on in America.

Then, there was the food-substitutes graft. Hoover put the dealers in these substitutes under license and "regulated" their profits; but the mills and manufacturers were omitted from the regulations, and the manufacturers' prices for substitutes had only the sky as the limit. These profiteers literally gorged themselves with extortionate profits.

But the crowning infamy of Hoover's schemes to exploit the American farmers in the interests of his real patrons—the allied Governments—comes from the part he has played behind the scenes of the maladministration of the wheat administrator, Julius Barnes, promoted to that high place from his office in Duluth, where he was king of the grain gamblers.

From his place in the confidence of President Wilson, at Paris, Hoover manipulated the appointment of Barnes as soon as Congress had passed the bill appropriating a billion dollars to make good the Nation's previous guaranty of a minimum price for the 1919 wheat crop.

Immediately upon his appointment, Barnes issued a proclamation suspending the export of wheat and wheat flour to all countries except those of our allies in the war. The rest of the whole world, hungry for wheat and flour, was shut out of the American market.

At the time of the Barnes-Hoover proclamation the Chicago wheat market was 60 cents per bushel over the Government's guaranteed minimum. Only our allies could purchase wheat or wheat flour. The allied Governments were represented in this country by a single buying agency, the Wheat Export Co., of New York. As no one could buy for export save Barnes and this foreign-owned price-depressing monopoly, down crashed the wheat price. One other step was necessary to make effective this graft for the Wheat Export Co.—that there should be no competition from American mills, bakeries, or grain buyers. Competitive buying would have raised wheat prices above the Government's guaranteed minimums.

These three classes were called into conference in the New York office of Wheat Administrator Barnes. There an understanding was had by which wheat, as wheat, was to be purchased only at the Government guaranteed minimums on the various terminal markets. But the Barnes agreement permitted all three of these classes to take their usual and liberal profits of the war period, so they were content. And this strangle hold of the Wheat Export Co. on the American wheat price was continued for eight months, during which period American

wheat farmers were forced to market 700,000,000 bushels of wheat, on an unlawfully and fraudulently depressed market.

Thus was the object of the American Congress set at naught; the world's competitive bidding rendered impossible for what was shown by the United States Department of Agriculture to be the greatest surplus wheat crop ever grown on American farms, and allied Governments permitted to buy American-grown wheat at prices greatly under the guaranties these same Governments had given their own wheat farmers.

The American wheat farmers were thus mulcted in tens of millions in the forcibly reduced export price of wheat, and in addition were mulcted in even more huge sums by the unlawful choking down of the prices on American markets.

Can anybody marvel, then, at the statement of Senator GRONNA in the United States Senate that the grossly unfair maladministration of Hoover and Barnes had cost the American wheat farmers since the United States entered the war the staggering total of \$2,000,000,000?

Upon occasion and upon occasion while the country of his nativity was at war for the saving of western civilization Hoover perpetrated wrongs like those I have recited. Columns might be written, all in truth, of Hoover's cold and calculated betrayal of his country's farm men and women in the interests of alien Governments, and whose newspapers are now going as far as they dare in joining the clamor of the profiteering propaganda here to put into the Presidency the very king of graft promoters.

And the Republican newspapers and Republican leaders—some of them—are seeking to foist this unspeakable expatriate Hoover upon the Republican Party—the party in all its history to which the American farmer has given his loyalty and devotion.

Would it not be an outrage infinite upon American farm men and women? Would it not be a real tragedy for the Republican Party?

SAM W. TEAGARDEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPER]. The resolution was agreed to.

#### RETIREMENT OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, on Saturday last I submitted the conference report on the civil service retirement bill, and I gave notice at that time that I would move to proceed to the consideration of the report to-day; but this morning the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made earnest request that the consideration of the report go over until to-morrow. The Senator from Alabama is not now in the Chamber, and I think he may have understood that I agreed that the report should go over. Knowing that the request that it go over was made in entire good faith and without any desire to delay the consideration of the report, but in order that Senators might have a little further time for its consideration, I agree that it may go over until to-morrow, and I give notice that immediately after the close of the morning business to-morrow I shall move to take up the conference report for consideration.

#### RECORDS OF RECLASSIFICATION COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to provide for the preservation and maintenance of the records of the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have no objection to taking up the joint resolution, provided that the amendment on page 2, beginning in line 7 down to and including line 12, be disagreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. So far as I am personally concerned, I am in favor of the amendment reported by the committee, but in order to expedite the matter I will say to the Senator that personally I shall not ask the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be satisfactory; but I merely want to say, Mr. President, that I hope Congress never will vote for any legislation authorizing the detail of employees from one department of the Government to another. It is wrong in principle and should never be practiced.

In the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill this question came up before the Appropriations Committee, and when we inquired into the question we found that the practice had been, not merely in one of the departments of the Government but in most of them, that employees, paid from lump-sum appropriations salaries that no appropriation bill would ever

carry and that Congress never would agree to, were being detailed from one department to another department to do the same identical work for which men paid in that department under the statutory roll received hardly half what was being paid under the lump-sum appropriation. It is for that reason, and that only, that I object to this amendment; and I am very glad the Senator from New Mexico has consented that it shall be rejected.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I will state, however, in justification of the committee's action in proposing this amendment, that the situation with regard to this matter is somewhat peculiar. During the work of the Reclassification Commission a number of people were detailed from the various departments to aid the committee in that work. These detailed employees have become experts in this matter, and I am confident that they could carry on this work very much better than anyone else could do it. I had nothing to do, however, with the proposing of the amendment. It was a matter which was acted upon by the committee to which the resolution was referred, and the amendment was thought justified by that committee. I think myself that under general conditions the Senator from Utah is right in his position, but these people are especially fitted to perform this duty. However, under the circumstances I shall not insist upon the amendment, and I ask that the joint resolution may be taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to provide for the preservation and maintenance of the records of the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment with an amendment, and it was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed, upon request of the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, to assume custody of the records and reports of the said joint commission, which was created by section 9 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1919, and to maintain and keep current such records pending the consideration by Congress of the final report and recommendations submitted to it by the said joint commission, under the system established by said joint commission for reporting and recording changes in the personnel and the number and nature of positions in the municipal government, the various executive departments, and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia, except the navy yard and the Postal Service.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the committee.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 7, after the words "Postal Service," the committee proposes to insert:

*Provided, That the heads of the various governmental services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized, as provided in the original act, to detail officers and employees not exceeding 20, and without additional expense for clerical services, to carry out the purposes of this resolution.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CALLING THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Gronna	McNary	Spencer
Brandegee	Hale	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Harris	Nugent	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Henderson	Page	Thomas
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Phipps	Townsend
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Trammell
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Edge	Kendrick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
France	Kenyon	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Smith, S. C.	
Gay	Lodge	Smoot	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are absent on official business.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names, not a quorum. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FERNALD, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MOSES, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. KING, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COMER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. ROBINSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GLASS] on important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under the rule requiring a consideration of the calendar on Monday be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has the permission of the steering committee to bring up this bill, or if he has it arranged in any way that this bill shall be brought up now?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There has been no arrangement that it shall be brought up now. I spoke to some of the different Senators the other day about when they wanted to bring up the shipping bill.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator when it was reported from the committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was reported on May 4.

Mr. KENYON. About a week ago?

Mr. JONES of Washington. About a week ago.

Mr. KENYON. The reason why I ask these questions is that I am curious to know how a bill reported only a week ago can be placed on any assignment by a steering committee, when bills that have been reported out of committees months ago, such as the bill for the regulation of the packers, can secure no consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know whether it has been done by a steering committee or any body of that kind. I was asked to bring it up to-day.

Mr. KENYON. I am not opposing the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I understood from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that this bill was to be brought up to-day, because I had a consultation with him about an appropriation bill, and he said that unless there should be some appropriation bill to be considered he expected that this bill would be brought up this morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know anything about that.

Mr. KENYON. Did the Senator from Wyoming say that it had been arranged?

Mr. WARREN. I did not say that I knew it had been arranged. I said that I understood from the Senator from North Dakota, chairman of the steering committee, who talked to me about an appropriation bill, that the shipping bill was to come in, though not to displace the appropriation bill; that it was on the urgent list because in many ways it affected appropriations and financial matters.

Mr. KENYON. I am not protesting against the consideration of this bill, but I am suggesting that other bills, which have been here for months, notably the "packers bill," can receive no place for consideration, while a bill of this character can be brought up. I want to say further that, despite the fact that no place is given the "packers bill" by the steering committee, an effort will be made to take it up at every convenient time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill being taken up, and in fact I thoroughly appreciate its great importance, and hope that it will be taken up, but I wanted to arrange with the chairman of the committee that certain amendments would be passed over in the consideration of the bill, so

that I might have an opportunity to discuss them at a later date. Of course, if they should be agreed to at this time it would make it rather difficult to discuss them at a later date without a reconsideration. There are four or five sections of the bill that I wish to discuss before the bill is finally passed, and I simply wanted to make that arrangement. I understand that other Senators have a similar view.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think there will be any trouble about that. I certainly will give my consent, as far as I am concerned, to pass over any amendment which any Senator desires to have passed over until we get through with the bill.

Mr. EDGE. That was my thought. I do not want to delay the bill for one moment. I do not think there is any more important legislation pending than that designed to settle the policy for the future of the merchant marine; but I would like to have an opportunity of discussing some of the sections and I want to have them passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

#### NEW YORK STATE BARGE CANAL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], in charge of the bill which has just been called up. I purpose asking unanimous consent to call up at this moment a joint resolution which is on the calendar, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of H. R. 10453. Although not of tremendous importance to the country at large, it is of considerable importance to the State which I, in part, represent. It is a joint resolution introduced by me and reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If it creates no discussion, I shall have no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am positive there will be no discussion of it.

Mr. KENYON. I would like to ask the Senator from New York, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the steering committee, as to what arrangements have been made by the steering committee for the balance of the bills for this session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not aware of any arrangement of a definite character that has been made.

Mr. KENYON. Have no bills been assigned for consideration by the Senate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To my knowledge there has been no definite assignment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not think I have any objection, but the joint resolution has not been read in full, and I would like to have the Senator from New York make a short statement as to its purport.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Section 201 of H. R. 10453 is that section of the recently enacted railway legislation which confided to the War Department the management of inland water transportation. It was intended originally to cover only the operation of barges upon the Mississippi and the Warrior Rivers, but inadvertently the language was so drawn as to include the canals. It so happened that during the recent war the Legislature of New York and the canal board of New York placed at the disposal of the Federal Government the New York State Barge Canal, and the Government proceeded to operate barges upon that canal as a war measure. Inadvertently, as I said a moment ago, that operation is continued under the railway legislation passed a few weeks ago.

The people of the State of New York built these canals, paid for them themselves, have taxed themselves for them, and so long as the Government operates barges upon the canal owned and built by the people of the State of New York no citizens of that State will go into the barge canal-business. At the earnest request of the governor, the legislature, the canal board, and the superintendent of public works, who has charge of the canal in New York, a hearing was held before the Interstate Commerce Committee, presided over by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and this Senate joint resolution was reported. Its effect is to remove from the New York State barge canal system the Government management and operation of barges and to direct the sale of the barges by the Secretary of War.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no desire in the world to interfere with the legislation which the Senator desires in reference to his own State, but a part of the railway legislation relates

to transportation on the Warrior and Mississippi Rivers, in which I am very much interested, and which I would not like to have disturbed. Therefore I would like to have the joint resolution read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is very brief and quite explicit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The READING CLERK. The Committee on Interstate Commerce report to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That at the end of 30 days after the passage of this resolution the authority conferred upon the Secretary of War under section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, to operate for commercial purposes boats, barges, tugs, or other transportation facilities upon the New York State Barge Canal shall cease, and thereafter there shall be no such operation by the Secretary of War or any other agency of the United States. The Secretary of War shall within said 30 days, or as soon thereafter as practicable, dispose of all boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities purchased or constructed for use upon the said canal, giving to proposed purchasers who intend to use the same upon the said canal the first opportunity to buy, and, pending final disposition, the Secretary of War may lease the same for such use. If the Secretary of War and any such proposed purchaser are unable to agree with respect to price, and the proposed purchaser is willing to fix a price by arbitration, the Secretary of War shall select one arbitrator, the proposed purchaser one arbitrator, and the two thus chosen shall select a third. The award may be made by a majority of the arbitrators and when made shall be final.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, as the joint resolution relates entirely to the affairs of the State of New York, I have no objection. I just desired to have it read so that I might be sure how far it went.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### WORK OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I desire to interrupt the proceedings for just a moment, as I am obliged to leave the Chamber. I wish to make one or two statements in connection with the work of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

As is generally known by Members of the Senate, each member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is appointed a subcommittee, who has charge of the nominations from certain designated States which have been assigned to him. Out of courtesy, that committeeman presents the nominations from any State to the two Senators from that State, with the idea of getting their approval, and if they have objections to the confirmation, which are based on complaints or reasons which the committee should consider, it is the duty of the subcommittee then to present those complaints to the whole committee. Otherwise, the subcommittee, if he has the approval of the two Senators from the State and there are no complaints filed with the committee, reports them directly to the Senate in executive session and they are acted upon without further consideration by the committee.

A condition prevails at the present time which is to say the least most annoying. Nominations have been submitted by the subcommittees to the various Senators from the States and many of them have been holding these nominations since last January without any complaint being made to the subcommittee or to the committee. When we ask for them they simply say they are not yet ready to report or to sign.

I make this statement now so that all Senators may understand that the committee will not withhold action upon these nominations unless the Senators within a reasonable time submit their objections, founded upon some complaint which they are ready to prosecute so that we can proceed in an orderly manner with the nominations. The committee are constantly besieged by representatives of appointees for a reason why the nominations have not been acted upon. The Post Office Department call us up and want to know why the nominations are not confirmed, and we have no reason to give except that Senators are holding the nominations.

So, Mr. President, I desire to give notice—and I should like to have all the Members of the Senate present to hear it, but they probably will read in the Record what I say—that hereafter, within a reasonable time, these names will be reported to the Senate, and Senators will then act at their own pleasure in executive session as to whether or not the nominations shall be confirmed. I am very willing, indeed, to extend every possible courtesy to every Senator; to listen to what he may have to say with reference to nominations, but where we are not even approached in reference to the matter but the names are held for months without consideration—where that

is done—it is beyond reason; and I propose to act upon such nominations.

There is another matter, Mr. President, to which I desire to advert. I suppose that every Senator is receiving a large amount of correspondence relative to the report of the Joint Commission on the Readjustment of Salaries of Postal Employees. That commission has been at work some 17 or 18 months, or, at least, it has been that length of time since it was appointed. It is confronted with a much larger task than was anticipated when the joint commission was created. Very many events have happened, circumstances beyond the control of the committee itself, which have necessarily delayed action; but the commission has been industrious, and it is now busily engaged in completing its work. It meets daily; it has a very large amount of work already completed. Necessarily all branches of the work are more or less correlated and interrelated, and until we can get a complete report a bill can not be framed and introduced and urged for passage. Nobody realizes more fully than do I the desperate situation in which the Postal Service is to-day, so far as its employees are concerned. People are leaving the service very rapidly. To-day I received in one mail 396 letters from different parts of the country, from business organizations, advising me as to the conditions of the Postal Service in various localities, and asking that action be taken.

I make this statement now, Mr. President, in order that Senators and the country may know that the joint commission is about ready to report. It would be folly, it seems to me, for that commission to make a report unless it made a complete report, for the question involved must be settled rightly. It is of more consequence that it be settled in that way than it is that immediate relief be granted, which will be only temporary and, possibly, a makeshift at that.

Mr. President, I desire to make another statement upon my own responsibility which, however, I think is approved by most of the Senators with whom I have spoken, that whatever action Congress may take in reference to the increase and readjustments of the salaries of postal employees will date necessarily as of July 1. It is not thought we could pass any legislation that would affect existing appropriations, but that it should take effect as of July 1.

If we fail to secure the passage of a measure of relief based upon the scientific report of the joint commission by the end of this session or by the time we take a recess—if we do take a recess—I have no doubt that whatever action we take will date back to July 1. Certainly that is the date when it should take effect, because we are to-day holding in the service thousands of men who are relying upon the action of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to grant the relief which is absolutely necessary to the existence of very many of them.

So, Mr. President, the commission is industriously at work and is about completing the business which was assigned to it, a very great and complicated business and of the greatest importance. As soon as that report is made, I propose to call the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads together for the purpose of considering a measure of relief; and, I repeat, whether or not that action is taken at this session or before we take a recess, the benefits, in my judgment, should, and I hope will, date as of July 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], has said about the report of the joint commission. I happen to be one of the members of that commission, and I will say that that commission has made great progress in its deliberations recently, and I see no reason why we shall not have a report ready within a week; I see no reason why we should not get early action, and, as it seems to me, before the recess, for the reason that I do not believe there are going to be any differences between the members of the commission themselves. If we reach a unanimous report, as now seems to be most likely, I feel very sure that both branches of Congress will be glad to accept the views of the commission and enact them into law immediately. I have never seen any 10 men work better together than have the 10 members of this commission. I believe their conclusions will be recognized, certainly in the main, as fair and just.

The salaries of the employees of the Post Office Department need readjustment and in many cases need substantial increases. I feel no doubt that the report will be satisfactory to the two Houses of Congress, to the employees themselves, and to the country; and will commend itself as a fair and just measure. I see no reason why it may not be adopted at the present session of Congress before we recess. I shall certainly use every effort



of which I am capable to see that the subject is brought up at the present session.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I desire to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I desire to ask him if my understanding is correct that the intent of the commission, so far as he has been able to ascertain, is that whatever changes are made in salaries of postal employees shall take effect as of July 1, the beginning of the next fiscal year?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have assumed that that course would be followed.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, as a member of the joint commission, I can say that the commission has had that idea in mind in their deliberations. They began some time ago to take testimony; they have gone around the country; they have visited the great postal centers and they have taken testimony here. They are now about to complete their report; it may be possible that their report will reach the Senate this week, and legislation may be enacted in reference to the matter before the end of the fiscal year. However, in the event that it should go beyond that time, the commission will recommend that the changes which they propose shall take effect as of July 1.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that whatever increases there are will begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1920, and be prospective rather than retroactive?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, that is the idea of the commission. I wish to say, further, that I am not a member of the joint commission. The Senate will probably understand the circumstances which prevented my going on the commission at the time it was appointed; but I have been in constant touch with the commission, and I know that what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and other Senators have stated is correct, that the commission is not shirking any duty but that it is trying to handle successfully and efficiently the most difficult problem which has been intrusted to it.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Commerce Committee with amendments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it may be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 1, after line 2, to insert:

That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best-equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States; and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and, in so far as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this act, the United States Shipping Board shall, in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws, keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be attained.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 12, after the word "hereinafter," to insert "in this section," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 2. (a) That the following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed, subject to the limitations and exceptions hereinafter, in this section, provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to insert:

(5) Sections 5, 7, and 8, shipping act, 1916.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why so many existing statutes are proposed to be repealed by the act?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The various statutes referred to here are the various emergency acts passed during the war,

under which the appropriations were made, and under which the ships were built.

Mr. THOMAS. They were for emergency purposes only?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes. The pending amendment is to repeal sections 5, 7, and 8 of the shipping act of 1916. All those provisions are covered by the terms of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. My inquiry, of course, went to the whole scheme of repeal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the word "or," to strike out "part" and insert "parts"; and in line 23, before the word "shall," to strike out "part" and insert "parts," so as to make the clause read:

(2) All rights, interests, or remedies accruing or to accrue as a result of any such contract or agreement or of any action taken in pursuance of any such act or parts of acts shall be in all respects as valid, and may be exercised and enforced in like manner, subject to the provisions of subdivision (c) of this section, as if this act had not been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 4, after the word "such," to strike out "act" and insert "acts"; in the same line, after the word "or," to strike out "part" and insert "parts"; in line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "act which" and insert "acts, but such acts or parts of acts"; in line 7, before the word "penalty," to strike out "such" and insert "the"; and in the same line, after the word "penalty," to insert "therein provided for the violation thereof," so as to make the clause read:

(3) The repeal shall not have the effect of extinguishing any penalty incurred under such acts or parts of acts, but such acts or parts of acts shall remain in force for the purpose of sustaining a prosecution for the enforcement of the penalty therein provided for the violation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

(4) The board shall have full power and authority to complete or conclude any construction work begun in accordance with the provisions of such acts or parts of acts if, in the opinion of the board, the completion or conclusion thereof is for the best interests of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 18, after the word "or," to strike out "part" and insert "parts"; in the same line, after the word "of," to strike out "act" and insert "acts"; and in line 21, after the word "compensation," to insert "Provided, That any person dissatisfied with any decision of the board shall have the same right to sue the United States as he would have had if the decision had been made by the President of the United States under the acts hereby repealed," so as to make the clause read:

(c) As soon as practicable after the passage of this act the board shall adjust, settle, and liquidate all matters arising out of or incident to the exercise by or through the President of any of the powers or duties conferred or imposed upon the President by any such act or parts of acts; and for this purpose the board, instead of the President, shall have and exercise any of such powers and duties relating to the determination and payment of just compensation: *Provided*, That any person dissatisfied with any decision of the board shall have the same right to sue the United States as he would have had if the decision had been made by the President of the United States under the acts hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### THE DYE INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8078) to regulate the importation of coal-tar products, to promote the establishment of the manufacture thereof in the United States, and, as incident thereto, to amend the act of September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, because of the importance of the bill which has just been taken up I ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington how long he expects the merchant-marine bill will occupy the attention of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If we can just keep going on with it we can get through in a day or two.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is of the opinion that it will take perhaps two days?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Really I have not heard of any opposition to the measure or of anyone who desires to discuss it, except that there are what might be considered minor amendments. It is barely possible, but I hardly think we can get it through to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wanted to ascertain, so as to gauge my own time by it, as I have an important committee hearing to attend.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that there are some provisions which I shall ask to have passed over on account of the absence to-day of Senators who will be here to-morrow.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator who has charge of the dye bill, which constitutes the unfinished business, if he intends to ask to have it called up before the merchant marine bill is completed?

Mr. CURTIS. It was not the intention to call it up again to-day, and to-morrow it will not be called up because of the peace resolution, which is likely to come up.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the Senator from Kansas if it is the intention to postpone action on the dye bill and the merchant marine bill pending action on the peace resolution?

Mr. CURTIS. I am in charge of the dye bill only temporarily. I do not know what course will be pursued by the Senator in charge of the bill when he returns. I am merely in charge of it during the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MOSES. I suggest that it might as well go to the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS. The bill is already on the calendar.

Mr. MOSES. But it is on the calendar as the unfinished business.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I ask that it may hold its place on the calendar as the unfinished business. I promise that it will not be taken up to-day, and I think it will not be taken up to-morrow because of the peace resolution coming up, and it will not be called up while the peace resolution is pending. If I have charge of the dye measure, it will not come up until after the merchant marine bill is disposed of.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to ask the Senator, Is it the intention to have the peace resolution taken up and displace the dye bill as the unfinished business?

Mr. CURTIS. It may and it may not be. There will be a request made at 2 o'clock to-morrow to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business. Of course, if that is objected to, I judge that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LORGE] will move to take up the peace resolution, which, of course, would displace the unfinished business if carried.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not the intention to take up the peace resolution before 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know about that. I have not asked the Senator from Massachusetts, but I am just advised by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] that he thinks it will be called up after the morning business to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it the intention to keep it continuously before the Senate until disposed of?

Mr. CURTIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will it be laid aside and be taken up from time to time as speeches are ready?

Mr. CURTIS. My understanding is that it is going to be kept before the Senate until disposed of.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. To the exclusion of other business?

Mr. CURTIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. POMERENE. Does this colloquy, which I have not been able to hear, have reference to the peace resolution?

Mr. CURTIS. A part of it.

Mr. POMERENE. I have an engagement of some considerable standing which is going to take me out of the city on Wednesday; I can not be back here until Thursday. I certainly hope that no attempt will be made to dispose of it on Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS. I, of course, have nothing to do with the peace resolution; that is, I am not on the committee nor have I charge of it. I am advised, however, that there are several speeches to be made on the resolution—two or three upon this side and three or four upon the other side. How long those speeches will take no one can tell. It was thought that the peace resolution, if taken up to-day, would be ready for a vote probably about Wednesday. If it is taken up to-morrow, I do not know whether it will reach a vote on Wednesday or Thursday. I have been told that there are several speeches to be made upon the resolution, but I have no positive information upon that point.

Mr. POMERENE. I think I am about as diligent in attendance upon the sessions of the Senate as any Member of it. I made this engagement some weeks ago, and I can not with propriety forego it. Meanwhile if the steering committee sees fit to take up a matter of this very great importance, I do not think it should be pressed for immediate passage. I have not any desire whatever to avoid or evade a vote upon the resolu-

tion, but it does seem to me that a little consideration should be given me.

Mr. CURTIS. I am satisfied that the Senator from Massachusetts will give consideration to the Senator from Ohio; but the Senator realizes that I, not being on the committee and not having charge of the measure, of course, have no right to say what will be done. I am simply giving the Senator the information which has come to me.

Mr. POMERENE. I have observed that the resolution was not called up to-day, because it was the desire that certain other Senators might return, so that they could be here Tuesday or Wednesday. I am not of the class who were had in mind at that time, but I am speaking of the predicament in which I find myself, and I have no hesitancy in saying that I believe it is due me that a vote shall not be had on Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS. I am informed that the Senator from Massachusetts is on his way here, and I suggest that the Senator from Ohio take up the matter with him after the Senate goes on with the pending measure.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall not object to-day to the temporary displacement of the regular order of business, but I shall reserve the right to do so when the request is renewed to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and, without objection, the consideration of the shipping bill will be proceeded with.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

SEC. 3. That section 3 of the "shipping act, 1916," is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That a board is hereby created, to be known as the United States Shipping Board, and hereinafter referred to as the board. The board shall be composed of seven commissioners, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and the President shall designate the member to act as chairman of the board, and the board may elect one of its members as vice chairman. Such commissioners shall be appointed as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act and shall continue in office two for a term of one year and the remaining five for terms of two, three, four, five, and six years, respectively, from the date of their appointment, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he succeeds. The commissioners shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient discharge of the duties imposed on them by this act, and two shall be appointed from the States touching the Pacific Ocean, two from the States touching the Atlantic Ocean, one from the States touching the Gulf of Mexico, one from the States touching the Great Lakes, and one from the interior, but not more than one shall be appointed from the same State. A vacancy in the board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. No commissioner shall take any part in the consideration or decision of any claim or particular controversy in which he has a pecuniary interest. Each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office, and shall not be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any common carrier or other person subject to this act, nor while holding such office acquire any stock or bonds thereof or become pecuniarily interested in any such carrier. The duties of the board may be so divided that under its supervision the directorship of various activities may be assigned to one or more commissioners. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the board shall not impair the right of the remaining members of the board to exercise all its powers, and four members shall constitute a quorum. The board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed. The board may adopt rules and regulations in regard to its procedure and the conduct of its business. Each member of the board shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum. The board may employ, within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress, such attorneys as it finds necessary for proper legal service to the board in the conduct of its work, or for proper representation of the public interests in investigations made by it or cases or proceedings pending before it, whether at the board's own instance or upon complaint, or to appear for or represent the board in any case in court or other tribunal, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume that this section, if enacted into law, will displace the present Shipping Board?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is my understanding.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there a provision by which the present board shall hold until the new board is appointed?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is not; but I think it might be wise to have a provision of that sort.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest to the Senator that otherwise there might be a hiatus, which would prove inconvenient to the administration of the board.



Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is a good suggestion. I will offer an amendment later with reference to that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to state that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] may desire to offer an amendment to this particular section as amended; and if so, I shall then ask to reconsider the vote by which the Senate adopted the amendment.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, referring to the bill under discussion and to section 3, which has just been acted upon, I am not going to offer an amendment to the section, but I wish to go on record very briefly, as a member of the Committee on Commerce, having given considerable consideration to the entire measure in its formation, as opposing the provision of that section creating a board of seven members. Personally I feel that the merchant-marine interests, so far as the Government is responsible for the continuation of their administration, would be better administered by one commissioner. However, I would have been glad to have seen a compromise retaining the same number of commissioners we now have, namely, five. I really see no use for seven commissioners at \$12,000 per year to administer the affairs of the merchant marine. I appreciate that the various sections of the country are covered under the details of the section, so that commissioners must come from the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and the interior; but personally I oppose the general policy of large boards to administer business details.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I desire to take the occasion to express the greatest appreciation for the hard and earnest work of the committee, and particularly of the chairman of the committee, in evolving what in a general way I believe to be a splendid plan; but I am not in sympathy with the general policy of control and administration proposed by the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 7, line 6, to change the number of the section from "2" to "4"; in the same line, before the word "vessels," to strike out "merchant"; in line 10, after the word "acts," strike out "and" and insert "or"; in line 11, after the word "section," to strike out "1" and insert "2"; in line 20, before the word "required," to insert "in the opinion of the President"; in the same line, after the word "required," to strike out "in the military and naval" and insert "by any other branch of the Government"; and in line 22, before the word "transferred," to strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That all vessels and other property or interests of whatsoever kind, including vessels or property in course of construction or contracted for, acquired by the President through any agencies whatsoever in pursuance of authority conferred by the acts or parts of acts repealed by section 2 of this act, or in pursuance of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President to take over for the United States the possession and title of any vessel within its jurisdiction, which at the time of coming therein was owned in whole or in part by any corporation, citizen, or subject of any nation with which the United States may be at war, or was under register of any such nation, and for other purposes," approved May 12, 1917, with the exception of vessels and property the use of which is in the opinion of the President required by any other branch of the Government service of the United States, are hereby transferred to the board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 23, to change the number of the section from "3" to "5"; in the same line, after the word "order," to strike out "that the merchant vessels now owned or controlled by the United States may be returned to or placed under private ownership and operation, and to the end that an efficient merchant marine, adequate to meet the requirements of our ocean-borne commerce and to serve as a naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, may be established and operated by citizens of the United States," and insert "to accomplish the declared purposes of this act, and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof," in line 7, before the word "authorized," to strike out "hereby"; in line 8, after the word "practicable," to insert "consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act"; in line 10, before the word "citizens," to insert "persons who are"; and in the same line, after the words "United States," to strike out "(as defined in section 2 of the shipping act, 1916, as amended)"; in line 12, after the word "section," to strike out "4" and insert "6"; in line 13, after the word "section," to strike out "2" and insert "4"; in line 16, after the word "price," to insert "and interest"; in line 17, before the word "more," to insert "deferred"; in the same line, before the word "years," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty"; in

line 18, after the word "board," to insert "in fixing or accepting the sale price of such vessels"; in line 19, after the word "vessel," to strike out "is authorized to" and insert "shall"; in line 20, after the word "consideration," to strike out "in fixing the sale price of such vessels"; in line 21, after the words "price of," to insert "the available supply of"; in line 22, before the word "demand," to insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "vessels," to insert "freights received and prospects of their maintenance," so as to read:

SEC. 5. That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act, and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof, the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable, consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, to persons who are citizens of the United States except as provided in section 6 of this act, all of the vessels referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board. Such sale shall be made at such prices and on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe, but the completion of the payment of the purchase price and interest shall not be deferred more than 20 years after the making of the contract of sale. The board in fixing or accepting the sale price of such vessels shall take into consideration the prevailing domestic and foreign market price of the available supply of, and the demand for vessels, freights received, and prospects of their maintenance, the cost of constructing vessels of similar types under prevailing conditions, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 1, after the word "sold," to insert "and any other facts or conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell: *Provided*, That no sale shall be made at a less price than the cost at the time of making such sale of constructing vessels of similar types in private yards in the United States, after deducting the depreciation charge against the vessels sold generally allowed in shipping operations."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] would like that amendment to go over, although I presume he would just as lief discuss it to-day; but the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is also very much interested in it, especially in the proviso; so I ask that the amendment may go over.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest that the word "*Provided*" is misspelled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURRIS in the chair). The correction will be made, and the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 9, in line 10, after the word "act," to strike out "of."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to the fact that in the bill as it passed the House, in line 10, it read, "shipping act, of 1916, as amended," without any quotation marks around the words "shipping act, of 1916." I think we should have the quotation marks, so I want to amend that so as to have the words "shipping act, of 1916," appear stricken through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, in lines 9 and 10, the words "shipping act, of 1916."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then I want to reinsert, in quotation marks, "shipping act, 1916."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to insert "shipping act, 1916," in quotation marks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 9, line 12, to change the number of the section from "4" to "6"; in the same line, after the word "authorized," to strike out "hereby"; in the same line, after the word "empowered," to insert "if unable to sell to American citizens after diligent effort so to do"; and in line 15, after the word "determine," to strike out "subject to the same limitation as to completion of time of payments as provided in section 3," and insert "except that payment therefor shall be completed within 10 years," so as to read:

SEC. 6. That the board is authorized and empowered, if unable to sell to American citizens, after diligent effort so to do, to sell to aliens, at such prices and on such terms and conditions as it may determine, except that payment therefor shall be completed within 10 years—

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 18, after the words "such vessels," to insert "having a dead-weight tonnage of not exceeding 6,000 tons, unless such vessels are over 10 years of age."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that that amendment may be passed over for the same reason as the preceding one. I refer to the amendment in lines 18, 19, and 20.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I understand that the provision authorizing the sale to foreigners means that vessels under 10 years of age and in excess of 6,000 tons can not be sold. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It means that only vessels under 6,000 tons can be sold to foreigners and those over 10 years of age.

Mr. McKELLAR. Where they are over 6,000 tons and not over 10 years of age they can not be sold?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it means that only vessels under 6,000 tons can be sold to foreigners and only vessels over 10 years of age, whatever the tonnage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whatever the tonnage?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; as I understand.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, and that was my understanding of its intention.

Mr. EDGE. I can see very plainly the way the amendment is drafted that it can be subject to two interpretations. I had not noticed it until the Senator from Tennessee drew attention to it. I think it is a very important matter. The intent of the amendment—I offered the amendment in the committee and it was adopted—at least, my intent was that vessels over 10 years of age, of any tonnage, whether over 6,000 tons or otherwise, could be sold to foreigners. Of course, in the case of vessels under 6,000 tons, there is no question about it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. That is precisely what it says.

Mr. EDGE. Well, that is precisely what it means, or what I meant it to mean, at least. That is different from the way the Senator stated it, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 9, in line 20, after the word "shall," to insert "after careful investigation"; and in line 22, after the word "marine," to insert "and it shall make as a part of its records a full statement of its reasons for making such sale," so as to read:

As it shall, after careful investigation, deem unnecessary to the promotion and maintenance of an efficient American merchant marine, and it shall make as a part of its records a full statement of its reasons for making such sale.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at top of page 10, to insert:

SEC. 7. That the board is authorized and directed to investigate and determine as promptly as possible after the enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, what steamship lines should be established and put in operation from ports in the United States or any Territory, District, or possession thereof where adequate terminal connections with rail carriers can and will be made or already exist to such world markets as in its judgment are desirable for the promotion, development, expansion, and maintenance of the foreign and coastwise trade of the United States and an adequate postal service, and to determine the type, size, speed, and other requirements of the vessels to be employed upon such lines and the frequency and regularity of their sailings, with a view to furnishing adequate, regular, certain, and permanent service. The board is authorized to sell, and, if a satisfactory sale can not be made, to charter such of the vessels of the United States as will meet these requirements to responsible persons who are citizens of the United States who agree to establish and maintain such lines upon such terms of payment and other conditions as the board may deem just and necessary to secure and maintain the service desired; and if any such steamship line is deemed desirable and necessary, and if no such citizen can be secured to supply such service by the purchase or charter of vessels on terms satisfactory to the board, the board shall operate vessels on such line until the business is developed so that such vessels may be sold on satisfactory terms and the service maintained, or unless it shall appear within a reasonable time that such line can not be made self-sustaining. The Postmaster General is authorized to contract for the carrying of the mails over such lines at such price as may be agreed upon by the board and the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That preference in the sale or assignment of vessels for operation on such steamship lines shall be given to persons who are citizens of the United States who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested in such lines if the board is satisfied of the ability of such persons to maintain the service desired and proposed to be maintained, or to persons who are citizens of the United States who may then be maintaining a service from the port of the United States to or in the general direction of the world-market port to which the board has determined that such service should be established: *Provided further*, That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at top of page 12, to insert:

SEC. 8. That it shall be the duty of the board, with the object of promoting, encouraging, and developing ports and transportation facilities in connection with water commerce over which it has jurisdiction, to investigate territorial regions and zones tributary to such ports, taking into consideration the economies of transportation by rail and highway and the natural direction of the flow of commerce; to investigate the causes of the congestion of commerce at ports and the remedies applicable thereto; to investigate the subject of water terminals, including the necessary docks, warehouses, apparatus, equipment, and appliances in connection therewith, with a view to devising and suggesting the types most appropriate for different locations and for the most expeditious and economical transfer or interchange of passengers or property between carriers by water and carriers by rail; to advise with communities regarding the appropriate location and plan of construction of wharves, piers, and water terminals; to investigate the practicability and advantages of harbor, river, and port improvements in connection with foreign and coastwise trade; and to investigate any other matter that may tend to promote and encourage the use by vessels of ports adequate to care for the freight which would naturally pass through such ports: *Provided*, That if after such investigation the board shall be of the opinion that rates, charges, rules, or regulations of common carriers by rail subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission are detrimental to the declared object of this section, or that new rates, charges, rules, or regulations, new or additional port terminal facilities, or affirmative action on the part of such common carriers by rail is necessary to promote the objects of this section, the board may submit its findings to the Interstate Commerce Commission for such action as such commission may consider proper under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 10, to change the number of the section from "5" to "9"; in line 11, after the word "sale," to insert "of a vessel made under the provisions of this act"; in line 12, after the word "board," to strike out "(in order that the United States may be protected against loss, liability, or damage, and have additional security for the payment of the balance of the purchase price and charges)"; in line 16, before the word "terms," to strike out "the" and insert "such"; in line 18, before the word "marine," to strike out "all"; in line 20, before the word "insurance," to insert "such"; in the same line, after the word "companies," to insert "associations"; in line 21, before the word "forms," to insert "such"; in line 22, after the word "amount," to strike out "approved by" and insert "as"; in the same line, after the word "board," to insert "may prescribe or approve"; in the same line, after the word "approved," to strike out "which insurance shall be made payable to it in event of partial loss or collision liability"; in line 25, before the word "insurance," to insert "such"; on page 14, line 1, before the word "forms," to insert "such"; in line 2, after the words "and to," to insert "such"; in the same line, after the word "amount," to strike out "approved by the board" and insert "as the board may prescribe or approve. The insurance required to be carried under this section shall be made payable to the board and/or to the parties as interest may appear. The board is authorized to enter into any agreement that it deems wise in respect to the payment and/or the guaranty of premiums of insurance," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That if the terms and conditions of any sale of a vessel made under the provisions of this act include deferred payments of the purchase price, the board shall require as part of such terms and conditions, that the purchaser of the vessel shall keep the same insured (a) against loss or damage by fire, and against marine risks and disasters, and war and other risks if the board so specifies, with such insurance companies, associations or underwriters, and under such forms of policies, and to such an amount, as the board may prescribe or approve, and (b) by protection and indemnity insurance with such insurance companies, associations, or underwriters and under such forms of policies, and to such an amount as the board may prescribe or approve. The insurance required to be carried under this section shall be made payable to the board and/or to the parties as interest may appear. The board is authorized to enter into any agreement that it deems wise in respect to the payment and/or the guaranty of premiums of insurance.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me that the phraseology on lines 3 to 5 of the amendment is rather confusing. It reads:

The insurance required to be carried under this section shall be made payable to the board and/or to the parties as interest may appear.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is a sort of technical language, using in these contracts of insurance. It was submitted by the Shipping Board officials. I know it is rather awkward.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know whether it is technical or not, but it would seem to a layman to be unintelligible.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is claimed that it is merely used under the technical rules.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 9, to change the number of the section from "6" to "10"; in line 11, before the word "which," to strike out "in"; in the same line, after the word "may," to insert "use"; in line 12, before the word "covered," to strike out "usually" and insert "commonly"; in line 13, after the word "policies," to insert "in such cases"; in line 16, after the word "board," to insert "are hereby transferred to the board"; and in line 17, after the word "board," to strike



out "the board shall at all times maintain adequate surplus and reserves as required by the best actuarial practice to secure any such policies, and to secure the reasonable costs, expenses, and charges of maintaining such insurance fund, and shall annually pay into the Treasury of the United States, as miscellaneous receipts, any net profits realized from the operation of such insurance fund," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. That the board may create out of net revenue from operations and sales, and maintain and administer, a separate insurance fund, which it may use to insure in whole or in part, against all hazards commonly covered by insurance policies in such cases, any interest of the United States (1) in any vessel, either constructed or in process of construction, and (2) in any plants or materials heretofore or hereafter acquired by the board or hereby transferred to the board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 11. That during a period of five years from the enactment of this act the board may annually set aside out of the revenues from sales and operations a sum not exceeding \$50,000,000, to be known as its construction fund, to be used in the construction, or in aid of the construction, of vessels of the best and most efficient type for the establishment and maintenance of service on steamship lines deemed desirable and necessary by the board, and such vessels shall be equipped with the most modern, the most efficient, and the most economical machinery and commercial appliances. The board shall use such fund to the extent required upon such terms as the board may prescribe to aid persons, citizens of the United States, in the construction by them in private shipyards in the United States of the foregoing class of vessels. No aid shall be for a greater sum than two-thirds of the cost of the vessel or vessels to be constructed, and the board shall require such security, including a first lien upon the entire interest in the vessel or vessels so constructed as it shall deem necessary to insure the repayment of such sum with interest thereon and the maintenance of the service for which such vessel or vessels are built. If there are routes upon which the board deems it highly important to establish service requiring vessels of the kind described in this section, and responsible persons, citizens of the United States, can not be found to construct the same the board may construct such vessels out of such fund in private shipyards in the United States, but no contract for such construction shall be let on a cost-plus basis, and when such vessels are sold the board shall require a cash payment of not less than 25 per cent of the purchase price and ample security for deferred payments. Interest on loans made under this section and on deferred payments shall be at a rate not less than 4 per cent per annum, payable semiannually.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, section 11 provides a very important policy, to which I think we should give some consideration. It very clearly provides that for five years, at least, the board may continue the construction of vessels on account of the Government entirely. I think the policy should admit of an opportunity for the Government to loan its credit to further develop and assure a workable merchant marine, but I question very much the policy of continuing outright on the account of the Government the construction of more ships. It is true, it simply provides that such construction shall be confined to \$50,000,000 which shall be set aside from sales and operation; but of course it is one and the same thing whether we retain \$50,000,000 from sales and operation, or whether we appropriate the money directly from the Treasury. It is the matter of spending that much money, or whatever part of it is expended, which otherwise would be saved to the taxpayers.

I feel, Mr. President, that the people of this country are opposed to any further continuation of the Government operation of the merchant marine than is absolutely necessary to put the merchant marine on a proper basis, and then as rapidly as possible we should have it absorbed by the private interests of the country under proper governmental regulation. The bill itself, by a section we have already adopted, very positively sets forth that policy, and authorizes and directs the Shipping Board, as I recall it, to sell the fleet as rapidly as good business will dictate, and yet we invite by this particular section the continued construction of ships at the same time we are directing the Shipping Board to dispose of the fleet.

I appreciate that there will be occasions when, in order to round out the fleet, the Shipping Board should encourage the construction in American yards of a certain type of ship; but I feel that the balance of the section, providing for aid on the part of the Government, two-thirds of the amount necessary being loaned by the Government under the provisions of the section, will provide for the filling of such necessities as they accrue. On the other hand, if we do provide for two methods of building these ships, one entirely by the Government and the other by the aid of the Government, it strikes me that it is reasonable to assume that the Government will be compelled to build the ships rather than private interests borrow the money and pay interest on it. I question the advisability of passing an act establishing the policy for the future, as we are unquestionably going on record, through this bill, that ultimately the entire fleet shall be in private hands, and at the same time we are directly authorizing the construction of more ships, for five years, entirely on account of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to make one or two remarks in connection with what the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] has said. While on the whole I am favorable to the bill, yet I think in some respects it is drawn on erroneous lines. It contemplates the establishment of a lot of Government shipping lines whether those lines pay or not. I call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the provisions of section 11, to which he refers, authorizing the board to expend from the revenues of sale and operation not to exceed \$50,000,000 a year in the building of new ships. If the board carries out the program provided for in section 7 of the bill, establishing independent routes in different parts of the country and operating them whether they are profitable or not, there will not be much left for the building of these new ships, because the cost of building is to come from the revenues from the sale and operation of the ships.

If Senators will examine the provisions of section 7, they will find that it contemplates the establishment of a large number of shipping lines to be operated by the Federal Government. There is no limitation to the length of time they shall be operated nor is there any inhibition against operating them at a loss. I think if they succeed in establishing these lines, many of them, they will be found to operate at a great loss.

It is not only ships on the high seas from port to port that make commerce. Commerce comes from the exporting and importing of the necessities and requirements of trade. If, for instance, the people of South America desire to ship their coffee to Boston or New York, we can not compel them to ship that coffee to Mobile or New Orleans by merely establishing a shipping line.

When it comes to the matter of exports, the people will export their goods in those directions and to those countries where they can most readily dispose of them at a profit. The farmers of the Mississippi Valley will have a great deal of agricultural products to export. They will naturally want to export these over the shortest and best route to reach the chief market, and the chief market for our agricultural products, taken wholesale or in the lump, is found in Europe. The people of this country are not going to divert their products as a mere matter of sentiment from the ordinary lines of commerce. Our people in the Mississippi Valley, who desire to ship their goods direct to Europe, are going to take the shortest and most rapid route to get the goods to Europe. They are not going to divert their commerce to ports at one side of the main routes of commerce. They are not going to send their traffic around by a by-path just for the sake of establishing traffic at a given small port, either on the Gulf coast or the Atlantic coast.

In one way I can sympathize with small ports on the Atlantic and Pacific regarding which there is an idea that by furnishing ships for them we can build up their commerce and give them a trade that under natural conditions they can not obtain.

If I thought that merely establishing shipping lines and furnishing shipping facilities would build up a commerce at those ports and give them the traffic that would warrant them in establishing the lines, I should not hesitate a moment in favoring such a disposition. But there are two matters involved in the problem. It is not only a matter of furnishing ships but it is the course and trend of the import and export trade of the country. In other words, will a certain class of commerce go to a certain port just because you have ships ready, or will it go to a port because the trade and traffic and market for the goods are there? My own idea is that you can not build up any such commerce by artificial means.

I should be very glad myself to see our commerce diverted and scattered over the country instead of concentrated at one or two ports on the Atlantic, but I doubt the scheme provided for in the bill, which is that by establishing lines in all these different ports we can succeed in diverting the commerce and traffic there.

I hope that that will be the result of the bill. I should be very glad if we can do it, but, in my opinion, the more of new lines established by the Government from small ports, the more we shall find the shipping left on the hands of the Government to be operated at a loss.

While I joined in reporting the bill favorably, the only criticism I have to make of it is that in its entirety it contemplates Government operation of ships on the seas. I was very much pleased with our railroad legislation when we took it out of the control of the Government. I hope the outcome may be to divert traffic out of the hands and control of the Government into the hands of private enterprise, into the hands of American citizens, and to vessels operated under the American flag. I hope that will be the outcome, but I very much doubt it.



I fear that the large board which has been created by the bill, scattered all over the country in order to meet certain local requirements, will result in the establishment of a lot of non-paying shipping lines that will be an expense to the Government years to come. I thought, when the committee was considering the bill, that it was a mistake to increase the board from five to seven. I think it would be a far better board if it were composed of not more than three members. Now it is made up of seven members, and they are going to be distributed throughout the country, and I fear it will lead to what we call in common parlance logrolling. I mean by that that the two representatives of the board on the Pacific will say to the members on the Gulf and Atlantic coasts, "Give us a line to Vladivostok, or give us a line to Shanghai, or give us a line to some of the far eastern ports; if you will give us that line we will give you a line from New Orleans to Africa, or we will give you one to China, or we will give you one to South America." They will say to the representatives on the Atlantic coast, "help us to establish these lines on the Pacific, and we will help you to establish the lines that you want here."

I do not mean to say it in an odious sense, but in this manner you will have a system of logrolling. You will have the representatives on the board from one part of the country looking at it wholly or largely from their standpoint and anxious to get what they want, and they will acquiesce in what the representatives in other parts of the country want. Thus you will have, as I said a moment ago, no end of logrolling on that board.

To avoid such a system of what, for short, I term "logrolling," I felt that it would have been much better and much wiser if we could have had a board of three members, independent of local interests in any part of the country, men who would represent all portions of the country in their entirety and would not be wholly swayed by local influence.

There are one or two other items in the bill to which I want to call attention. One is placing the Philippine Islands under the coastwise-trade provisions. I regard that as the most wicked and cruel provision in the bill. Those islands are more than 10,000 miles from our shore; their products are shipped all over the world. By putting them under the coastwise trade you practically say that none of the products of the Philippine Islands shall come to America except in American ships under the American flag. We have only one port there where we have much commerce direct to this country, and that is Manila. The great crops of the Philippine Islands are sugar—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator if this provision which he says extends our coastwise laws to the Philippines is incorporated in the House bill or in the Senate committee amendments?

Mr. NELSON. It is incorporated in a Senate committee amendment to the bill. The Philippine Archipelago extends from north to south upward of between 400 and 500 miles, and from east to west from 300 to 400 miles. In the north we have the island of Luzon, and south of that what are commonly called the Visayan group of islands. Among those are the islands of Mindanao, Mindoro, Masbate, Samar, Panay, Negros, Cebu, Leyte, Palawan, Bohol, all of them large islands; and it so happens that the chief exportable products which are produced in those islands are sugar and hemp. The greatest amount of sugar is, perhaps, produced in the island of Negros, which is between three and four hundred miles south of Manila. From other islands adjacent to that, which belong to the Visayan group, come considerable sugar, most of the hemp, and a large part of the tobacco which we get from the Philippine Islands. I do not take into account the rice crop of the Philippines, because while they may export some rice they import more than they export. They need as much rice for food in those islands as is there produced.

Nearly all of the products of the Philippine Islands which have come to this country during the recent war have come to us, not in American ships, but in foreign ships. What would be the result if we adopted the proposed policy? It would be a death blow to the commerce and trade of the Philippine Islands, because they will not be able to ship any of their goods to America; the American market will be cut off from them unless ships flying the American flag are furnished for the transportation of their products.

The other chief ports of the Philippine Islands are Cebu, a very good port on the island of Cebu, and Iloilo on the island of Panay. The sugar of Negros is transported a few miles across the island of Panay, and from there it is shipped abroad through the port of Iloilo.

I heard it remarked in committee by means of the plan proposed we could retain control of the sugar crop of those islands and insure its coming to this country. That can not possibly be true. Even if we put that commerce under the coastwise laws, what is to prevent foreign ships entering the port of Iloilo or the port of Cebu and transporting goods direct to Europe? If the commerce between the Philippine Islands and the United States is put under the coastwise laws, it will force the people of those islands to ship their sugar and hemp and other products to countries other than the United States.

Mr. President, I am utterly opposed to placing the people of the distant Philippine Islands into a strait-jacket as is proposed by the pending bill. It is true that the bill provides that the provision referred to shall not take effect for a year; and it is also true that the committee has recommended a further modification to the effect that the President may extend the time in case of necessity; but, Mr. President, I believe that those far-away islands should have the same privilege of trading with the world at large as we in the United States have. While I do not remember exactly their population according to the last census, there are in those islands, I think, between ten and twelve million people. They are situated ten or twelve thousand miles from our shores.

To enact legislation to the effect that those people can not ship any of their products from the Philippine Islands to any port in America, either on the Pacific or on the Atlantic coast or anywhere else, unless they are shipped in a vessel flying the American flag, will be destructive to the commerce and a burden to the people of those islands. Neither will it help our country in securing the products of the Philippines, because, as I have said, European vessels can go to any port of the islands, to Manila, to Cebu, or to Iloilo, and there buy their hemp and their sugar for shipment direct to Europe; and that is what they will do.

Mr. President, we have another anomaly in our shipping laws. It is not directly reenacted in the pending bill. The first legislation in reference to the matter, I think, was passed in 1868, and provided that no person could travel in a foreign vessel from one port in the United States to another port in the United States unless he paid a fine, which, under the original law, was \$2 a head; in other words, a foreign vessel could not take an American citizen from one port to another in the United States unless he paid, in the first instance, \$2. Some 11 or 12 years subsequently—I do not remember the exact date—that law was amended so that now a fine of \$200 is provided; that is, if a single passenger is carried from one port in the United States to another port in the United States in a foreign ship, that ship has to pay a penalty of \$200. My attention was called to that law some years ago. Some friends of mine became stranded in the Hawaiian Islands; they waited there for weeks and weeks for the arrival of an American ship to take them back to the Pacific coast, but none came. Finally a foreign vessel, a British ship, I think, came along, and they were obliged to travel in that ship in order to get to their destination.

The ship had to pay a penalty of \$200 for every American passenger which it carried from the Hawaiian Islands to the Pacific coast. Of course, the ship would not pay that penalty; the fine came out of the passengers; so that the man obliged to hurry home, to get back to America, in addition to his ordinary transportation charges had to pay \$200, for the ship would not bear the burden of its payment.

While I am in favor of limiting and restricting coastwise trade to American ships, I certainly think that travel in this country ought to be free; I certainly think that if any American citizen at any port in the United States or within its dominions has occasion to travel to another port in the United States he ought to have the privilege of traveling on the first ship that comes along and not be compelled to wait indefinitely or to pay a penalty of \$200.

As I have said, that provision is not in the pending bill. There is, however, a restrictive clause in the bill tending to carry out that idea in reference more particularly to conditions on the Pacific coast at Seattle. I refer to the provision prohibiting the checking of baggage of those who go out on our railroads and desire to go to Alaska. They may travel to the Pacific coast on the Northern Pacific or the Great Northern or any other route, and on reaching there may be anxious to take passage to a port in Alaska. Perhaps the first ship that comes along is a Canadian or British ship, but in the event they sail on such a vessel a provision in the bill prohibits them from checking their baggage. That, I think, is unduly and unjustly restrictive.

I am aware of the antipathy entertained on the Pacific coast against the Canadian Pacific and the Soo Railroad; but I wish to



say to those who entertain that feeling that the Soo Railroad, which is the American end of the Canadian Pacific in our country, has been of more value to our people in giving fair and reasonable rates than have any of the operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the matter of accommodations and of transportation our people have felt that the Soo Railroad—that is, the part that operates through Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and reaches down to Chicago—has, to some extent, been an antidote against the rapacity of some of the big western roads. So our people in the upper Mississippi Valley have never cherished the hostility toward the Canadian roads that seems to prevail in the Puget Sound section.

Mr. President, when I rose to reply, as it were, to the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] I had no idea of taking up so much of the time of the Senate. I have called attention briefly to what I regard as some of the unwise features of the bill, but recognizing the fact that all legislation is in the nature of a compromise, while I differed from the majority of the committee on some of these matters, I did not feel like obstructing the report on the bill or interfering with its passage; and even though I look upon some of the features of the bill as unwise, I shall not make any factious opposition. I hope that some of the objectionable matters may be cured in conference, and I hope that then the future will show the mistakes we are making in this legislation so that they may be remedied.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will take just a moment or two to refer to some of the matters to which the Senator from Minnesota has adverted. I appreciate more than I can say the attitude of the Senator in connection with this bill. He has shown the same broad-minded spirit with reference to it that he has shown with reference to all matters of legislation. I have the highest respect for his judgment and his opinion, not only with reference to the questions involved in the pending measure but with reference to other questions, and for the patriotic stand that he takes on all matters that are of interest to the country. While I hesitate to differ from him, I can not agree with him as to two or three of the propositions he has presented.

With reference to the coastwise trade and the passenger traffic to which he has just referred I wish to say just a word. He calls attention to the fact that some of his friends in the Hawaiian Islands were marooned for a while and had to pay \$200 as a penalty to get back to the United States because American ships were not available, the islands being embraced within our coastwise laws. The only provisions contained in this bill with reference to that feature of the coastwise law is a provision that prevents its evasion. Whether the coastwise law should be repealed is another question, but so long as we apply the coastwise policy to our ports it seems to me we should not permit a foreign country to evade that law. If the law says that American passengers shall not be carried in a foreign ship between American ports, we should not permit that law to be evaded by aliens, and all that we do by the provision of the pending bill in this respect is to prevent the evasion of the law.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, the necessity for the provision grows out of a situation peculiar to the trade between this country and Alaska. The Canadian Steamship Co. maintains an agency in this country in Seattle. If I go to their office and tell them that I want to go from Seattle, Wash., to Skagway, Alaska, an American port, what do they do? Under our coastwise law they can not sell a ticket directly from Seattle to Skagway.

They can not send a ship directly from Seattle to Skagway under our coastwise laws; what do they do? They sell me a ticket to Vancouver, British Columbia, and at the same time, in the same office in Seattle, they sell me a ticket from Vancouver to Skagway. They then send me to Vancouver, and I get off of one vessel and onto another, and go on to Skagway.

Mr. President, we have a provision in this bill to prevent that. It is a clear evasion of our law; and, as I have said, so long as we continue our coastwise laws I am not in favor of a foreign country evading them in that way. If our coastwise laws are not proper, if they should be done away with, all right; let us do away with them. That is another proposition. We should not keep them on our statute books and permit them to be nullified by alien competitors.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. EDGE. Did I understand the Senator to say, in leading up to that description of the situation on the Pacific coast, that we had in no way amended the coastwise laws under this bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all, in that respect.

Mr. EDGE. Then, we did not include the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes. That is another proposition. We do not change our coastwise law; we just extend it. I want to discuss that now for just a moment.

Mr. President, if we are going to have an American merchant marine, we shall have to take advantage of every opportunity we have to get it. I have no doubt about that. I do not blame any other country for doing everything it can to prevent us from establishing ourselves upon the sea. I admire them for it. What I should like to do is to take a leaf out of their book. This is really a new proposition for us. When the war began we had practically no ships under the American flag on the high seas. Practically the only shipping we had was in the coastwise trade, built up under our coastwise laws; and if we had not built up that merchant marine under the coastwise laws, the result of this war might have been far different, because when we got into this war the only ships that we really had available to transport our troops across the seas and carry supplies for them were ships taken out of the coastwise trade.

How did Great Britain build up her merchant marine? She built it up by saying that goods from her colonies should not be brought into Great Britain except under the British flag and in British ships. She continued that policy for years and years until she had built up her merchant marine. Then she removed those restrictions. Why, we remember in our histories reading about how the colonists were restricted in bringing products into this country. They could not bring them in except in ships flying the British flag, nor could they ship them except in the same way. Why? It was done under a wise and judicious national policy for the building up of a British merchant marine.

Mr. President, we want to build up our merchant marine in the foreign trade, the overseas trade. We had no such merchant marine when the war broke out, but we have a lot of ships now. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] said, however, ships alone do not make a merchant marine. They must have cargoes, they must have traffic, they must have business, or they will be laid up or be sold to foreign countries. Routes must be established and trade developed to maintain them.

Mr. President, the trade of the Philippines, between those islands and this country, is ours if we see fit to take it, and why should we not take it? Why should we not have it so long as we retain the Philippine Islands? When the opportunity is at hand for us to say that the traffic between those islands and the United States shall be transported in American ships, and thereby build up that much trade for American shipping, encourage the building of American ships, and the establishment of American lines across the Pacific, where we need them so badly, why should we not do it?

If the Senate does not think it is a wise thing to take the trade that is ours and hold it to our flag and to our ships, very well; but my opinion is, my judgment is, that this is something we ought to take when we can, and we ought to hold it. It does not mean injury to the Philippine Islands. Why, under the provisions of this bill we are very particular about that. We put it off for a year, and we direct the Shipping Board at that time to see to it that adequate shipping facilities are provided for those islands, so that their commerce will not suffer, but that ample facilities with proper rates for passengers and commerce shall be provided. Then we go further, we take an extra precaution, and we say that if at the end of the year there are not sufficient shipping facilities the President shall extend the time to such period as he sees fit and as may be necessary in order to establish proper and suitable shipping facilities. Surely these islands want this done. We are not going to put them in a strait-jacket. We are going to insure them access to the greatest market in the world.

Mr. President, I have this in mind: As the Senator said, it is 7,000 or 10,000 miles to the Philippine Islands. Fine ships will be required for that trade, splendid passenger ships, combination passenger and cargo ships, ships suitable for any ocean carrying trade. We will establish the lines that we want and that we ought to have, in a section and a territory where we need them and where we ought to have them.

What should we make out of Manila? We should make out of Manila the great distributing point in the Orient for the products of this country, and those products should be carried to Manila in American ships, and then distributed throughout the Orient in American ships. It would mean a prosperity, growth, and development for those islands they can have in no other way.

We do not interfere with the foreign commerce of those islands. So far as British ships are concerned, or Japanese

ships, or any other foreign shipping that desires to go into Manila from their ports, or to go into Manila from their ports and then go out from Manila to some other ports, we make no change. We do not interfere with that at all; but we do say that the trade between those islands and the United States shall be in American ships, under the American flag; that it will be for the benefit of this country and for the benefit of those islands.

Mr. President, in my judgment the closer we can bring those people to us, the better it will be for them, as well as for us. If we deal with them in the right sort of way, if we show them that we have their interests at heart, we will make them our friends, even better friends than they are now. If those islands should ever leave us, or be separated from us, we should maintain a relationship with them that will be not only of great benefit to them, but also of great benefit to us. This will be so if we establish close business relations with them now.

From every standpoint of American interests, the interests of the Philippines, and for the building up of our American merchant marine, it seems to me that it is wise, judicious, and patriotic to extend the coastwise laws to the Philippine Islands.

Now, just a word with reference to the fund.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator if he does not think that what is proposed in this bill is necessary in order that the Philippine people may be able to secure equal traffic conditions in their trade with this country and in their trade with other countries? That is to say, if the Philippines are to rely solely upon the ships of other countries than the United States, will not the shipping conditions that are imposed by our competitors, those who own these ships, naturally be such conditions as would drive the Philippine trade to European countries instead of to this country?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why, there is no question at all about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. That has been our difficulty with reference to the trade of other foreign countries. It would be our difficulty with reference to our trade with the Philippines. We will not secure American shipping facilities unless we give our facilities some advantage that far from home; and if we have no American ships to bring the trade of those islands to this country I think it is almost certain that we will not get anything like a fair share of the business of those islands. I believe that with the provision we have in this bill the United States will get a fair share of that traffic—in fact, will get the lion's share of that traffic—because this country always will be guaranteed rates to the Philippine Islands that are as favorable to trade with this country as rates from the Philippines to any other country in the world are favorable to that trade.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from North Carolina is absolutely correct; and I might suggest, Mr. President, that so long as we do nothing toward establishing steamship lines to the Philippines, the Philippines will get just whatever service foreign shipping sees fit to give them between them and this country. If it desires to give them irregular service, it will do it; and, as the Senator from North Carolina suggested, its endeavor and attempt will be to divert the trade of the Philippine Islands from the United States to its pockets.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. PHELAN. In that event, what will regulate the rates between American ports and the Philippines?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Shipping Board has authority under the shipping act to regulate our coastwise trade from port to port and on regular routes.

Mr. PHELAN. Is there no danger of retaliation by any power if we discriminate in favor of our own possessions? Has that been considered?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not see how they could retaliate, or have any ground for retaliation. We have a right to deal with our own territory as we see fit.

Mr. PHELAN. For information, I would like to ask the Senator whether he has considered the significance of the imperial preference? Great Britain, in dealing with her colonies, practices what is described as an imperial preference. What is the meaning of that, in so far as shipping is concerned?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not given that any consideration. It is an internal affair of the British Empire. She will look after that and we can not complain.

Mr. PHELAN. Recently the Australian Government refused an American ship the privilege of a return cargo of copra, which led to considerable correspondence with the State Department. Australia claimed, as the only reason why the refusal was made, that she needed the copra herself. That left the American ship to return in ballast; it had to endure a very great hardship. It is my information that there is an abundance of copra, and that it was a discrimination. I believe the State Department regarded it as a discrimination against the American ship. Therefore, in view of this announced policy, that the coastwise law shall be extended so that ships may ply between the Philippine Islands and the ports of the United States, I was going to observe that this imperial preference might properly justify a policy of discrimination on our part. That might strengthen the argument of the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So it would. It is but an example that should teach us to look after our interests as other nations look after theirs. Mr. President, I have looked at this problem, so far as I am concerned, just in this way: I feel that Great Britain will do everything in her power to promote British interests in trade and in shipping, and I do not blame her for doing it; I admire her for doing it. What I want is that we shall look after our interests in that same way, and that is what I have tried to do, to the extent of what little influence I have had in connection with the framing of this bill. It is a bill to aid and promote an American marine and no other.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, agreeing absolutely with what the Senator is endeavoring to accomplish, is there any method which the Government can adopt, learned from past experience, by which it is possible for the Government to establish these new lines to the Philippines, or any other section, which have not already been established, and maintain and administer them more cheaply—which means at cheaper rates—than private interests can maintain them?

My fear is that we are adopting a policy in which we announce that we want private interests to administer the merchant marine, and then surround the bill with such restrictions, or give to the Shipping Board such opportunities, that we are simply tying ourselves down to the administration of the merchant marine for years to come. I would like to see it more clearly established that the direction of it, given under one section of the bill, will be carried out under the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, that phase of it I was not discussing. I am discussing now the advisability of putting the Philippines under the coastwise law.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator was discussing his belief that the Government should establish new lines to the Philippines, and I am just trying to bring out from the Senator his view as to whether or not that should be a permanent proposition.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator knows that it is the declared policy of this bill to get these ships into private ownership ultimately. I do not agree with the suggestion the Senator made a while ago, that we want these ships disposed of, and that we are directing the Shipping Board to dispose of them as soon as practicable in a businesslike way regardless of anything else. We direct them to do it consistent with the declared purpose of this bill, which is to build up and maintain an American merchant marine. That is the essential thing; that is the important thing to be accomplished. That is of even higher importance than private ownership and private operation.

Will private parties establish shipping lines between this country and the Philippines? Is there anything we can do to induce them to do it? Mr. President, we might be able to induce them to do it if we would pay them many thousands of dollars in subsidies, but we have many times tried to pass subsidy legislation in order to have shipping lines established but we could not get it done; we could not pass it. Here is a 7,000-mile trip. Japanese ships are paid hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for traversing the Pacific Ocean between Japan and the United States, touching at the Philippines. In my judgment, Mr. President, there is nothing Congress can be induced to do, leaving these islands outside the coastwise laws, that would enable private owners to establish shipping lines in competition with Japanese shipping lines aided by the Japanese Government, through the assistance it gives to them.

But, Mr. President, there is one thing we can do; we can hold the trade of the Philippines under the American flag by passing the provisions in this bill. There is no doubt of that. That is one thing we can do. If we do not do it, we can have no excuse to offer if foreign shipping continues to carry the trade of the Philippines and if that trade with us should grow less and less.



The Senator fears that the Shipping Board will not act as we really intend it to act under the provisions of this bill. Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing we can put in the bill which will make the Shipping Board act wisely and fairly and justly. We must put confidence in somebody. We have to place the greatest discretion in somebody in dealing with the problems of the American merchant marine. We have placed it in the Shipping Board, the only agency in which we could place it. We must depend upon that board to act wisely, to exercise the power and the discretion we give it in a wise way; and what I would like to impress upon the Shipping Board, if I can do it, is that we want them to be animated by a spirit of Americanism; that we want them to be moved with the desire, an intense desire, to build up American trade, American shipping, and American interests. I want them to understand that we are placing in their hands the greatest and widest power, probably greater than was ever invested in any governmental organization before, and that we are giving them this power and giving them this discretion to use in the interest of American trade and American shipping, and not for the purpose of simply getting rid of the ships we have in the most expeditious way possible.

I would like to see these ships all in private American hands to-morrow; but, Mr. President, I do not want to see these ships sacrificed in price and the establishment of lines of trade fail in order to get rid of them. I want these ships to be used as the basis or the foundation of a great and permanent American merchant marine, and I feel sure it can be done if the board acts in the right way, and I believe the board will act in the right way. I will believe that until I see it acts otherwise.

Mr. PHELAN and Mr. EDGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of Washington. In just a moment. We have in this bill gone even further than I believe it is safe to go in directing the Shipping Board and limiting the powers of the Shipping Board in its disposition of these ships. I believe it is for us to lay down a great national policy that we want carried out and then let the Shipping Board lay down the administrative policies to effect that great object. The wider the discretion the more likelihood of success. I yield to the Senator from California. I think he addressed the Chair first.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in the conference report on "Fees for passports and visés," agreed to last Saturday, I find this section:

From and after the 1st day of June, 1920, it shall be unlawful for any alien, other than a seaman, to enter or attempt to enter the United States without a passport duly viséed by a person duly authorized by the Secretary of State to issue such visé: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to nationals of Great Britain domiciled in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Bermudas, or the Bahamas, or to nationals of France domiciled in St. Pierre and Miquelon, or to citizens of Cuba, Panama, or Mexico.

The privilege is denied to nationals other than those of Great Britain or France and citizens of Cuba, Panama, and Mexico residing in these near-by places of coming into the United States, under this new regulation, without passports or without the viséing of passports. Presumably they will be amenable to the immigration laws. I know nothing to the contrary. But in advices received from San Francisco within the last five days it appears that Judge Rudkin, judge of the Federal court, held that a Japanese seaman who had escaped from a Japanese vessel, a deserter, when apprehended could not be returned, that there was no law by which such a seaman escaping from a vessel could be deported. That is the customary way of seeking entry by those ineligible to land, not only the Japanese but anarchists and Bolsheviks and those who are bent upon the destruction of our Government, it is claimed. They come in as seamen. I can not understand why an exception should be made in favor of seamen under these circumstances, and why we should not require a passport or a visé at the port of departure, because then the American consul, in viséing such a passport, could determine whether they were bona fide seamen or not. This conference report was agreed to without any comment, and I will state to the Senator in charge of the bill that I was seriously contemplating offering an amendment to the shipping bill providing that seamen should not enjoy that exemption unless there is some very good reason why they should enjoy the exemption.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, personally I see no objection to it. What the reasons were for making that exception I do not know. If they were presented to me, they might appeal to me. But I am moved, in connection with this bill, by the spirit of doing everything in the world for American shipping and looking after our interests and our interests only; and I would like to see us do everything we possibly can for our interests and for the building up of a merchant marine.

I would extend no favors to any country unless I could see a corresponding or greater benefit to my country.

In connection with what has already been said, I am going to call attention to what Canada does with reference to this coastwise-trade law, the evasion of which we would like to prevent, and it will suggest to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] what the British do, what Canadians do, what the Japanese do with reference to maintaining their shipping, and something we do not propose to do in this bill.

I have here a document entitled—

Dominion of Canada report relating to mail subsidies and steamship subventions as controlled by the department of trade and commerce for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, with traffic returns, etc., to December 31, 1918.

Here are estimates for the year ending March 31, 1920, as compared with those for the year ending March 31, 1919, with statement of services rendered and expenditures to December 31, 1918, on account of mail subventions and steamship subventions. Apparently this is called chapter 18. It reads:

#### MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS.

Amount to be voted..... \$2,467,120.67

By Canada as subvention—for what purpose? For the purpose of maintaining shipping lines. What is one of the lines that is to be maintained by subvention?

Victoria, Vancouver, and Skagway. Skagway is in Alaska. It is an American port. How much do they pay the steamship company to maintain a line to Skagway? Twelve thousand five hundred dollars. They estimate \$12,500 for the year 1920. That line, paid \$12,500, maintains an agency in Seattle and evades the laws of the United States, and we are permitting her to do it. That we propose to stop by this bill if the Senate will indorse the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I gather from the previous remarks of the Senator from Washington, in referring to the fact that Congress had never granted a subsidy, that the Senator favors a subsidy by the Government in some form or another to assist in the development of American shipping.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I favor anything that will establish and maintain an American merchant marine, and I will support direct subsidy legislation if it is necessary. I do not believe that it is necessary at the present time. I believe we have some provisions here in this bill—you may call them subsidy provisions if you want to—that will do what we want done. One provision enables the administrative agencies to make contracts with reference to the carrying of mails. Instead of paying over \$2,000,000 of our own money to foreign steamship lines for carrying our mail I am in favor of paying it to our own; and I will go much further, so far as I am personally concerned, if necessary, to establish an American merchant marine.

Mr. EDGE. I want to make it clear that I rather agree with the Senator. The term "subsidy" seems to have had a rather bad sound in the country generally, but many efforts on the part of the Government will make up for what might ordinarily be called a direct payment of subsidy. The question I was leading up to is this: In establishing these lines, for illustration, to the Philippines, I assume from what the Senator says he imagines that they will be operated at a loss, inasmuch as I think the Senator stated that it would be impossible, in his judgment, to induce private capital to establish similar lines.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. EDGE. I wanted to get that clear.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I said I thought it would be impossible to induce private parties to establish these lines without putting them under the coastwise laws, leaving them in competition with the Japanese and letting the Japanese run their ships to Manila and then on to the coast. I think if we give notice that in a year from now the coastwise laws will be extended to the Philippines that private parties will go to work to prepare to take advantage of the trade and will establish private lines, and that it will not be necessary for the Government to do that. That is what I confidently believe.

Mr. EDGE. In other words, if in the meantime there is any loss because of the Government establishing these lines to the Philippines and thus endeavoring to encourage Philippine trade to this country, it will be in the nature of a subsidy in order to build up that business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I make no question about that at all.

Mr. EDGE. That is the point I am trying to bring out.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course the Senator and I agree with reference to that, but it will be more than balanced



by trade expansion and development that will take place, and the people of the country will approve it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am obliged to leave the Chamber because of another engagement. I assume, if this part of the bill is reached, that it will not be disposed of this afternoon?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator would like to have it go over—

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to say something on it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall be very glad to have it go over.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know that the Senator has made it perfectly clear yet that the Government, under the provisions of the bill, assumes no obligations whatever to establish these lines unless private individuals fail to establish them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true. I am glad the Senator emphasizes it. We try to emphasize that in the bill, that unless private enterprise does it, the Government will establish it. We also tried to emphasize that we do not want the Government to maintain it any longer than is necessary; that if they establish it and develop a good business and can sell the ships, we want them to do it, and I am sure this can be done. Let there be no mistake. We do not propose to extend the coastwise laws to the Philippines and leave them without shipping. It is made as plain as can be that ample shipping facilities shall be ready when the coastwise laws are extended and that such shipping is to be maintained.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the first place, we allow a year in which this provision of the bill is not to become operative; that is, a year's time in which private individuals may get ready for this trade. At the end of that period the President may further extend the time of Government operation, if it is wise to do so, in order to give further opportunity for private capital to supply the requirements of the trade. That is what I understand the bill to provide.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

Mr. EDGE. May I interrupt the Senator there? If private capital could not make a reasonable profit on the operation, is it not reasonable to assume that the Government can not make any profit on the operation, judging from previous experiences in governmental administration?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course, if private capital can not operate the line at a profit, the Government can not do so.

Mr. EDGE. Then we must assume that it is a subsidy.

Mr. SIMMONS. The purpose of the bill is to offer inducement to private capital to do that. If private capital does not do it, then the Government of the United States, in the interest of its trade with these islands, proposes that it will operate this line, whether at a profit or a loss. It may be, for that question continually arises, that the Government can not operate these ships at a profit—I mean a profit upon the actual operations—but the Government has other interests in the Philippine Islands than that of making money out of the ships, which it may have to supply as a last resort, in order that the country may get its proper share of the trade with one of its own possessions.

If the Senator from Washington will pardon me just for a moment—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt that under present conditions the people of the United States are not enjoying anything like as large a part of the trade of the Philippine Islands as they are entitled to enjoy. I have no doubt that under present conditions Japan, Great Britain, and other European maritime nations who supply the Philippines with their ocean transportation are doing it upon conditions that are much more favorable to the shipment of their products and the purchase of their supplies from foreign countries and the United States; that they are getting to-day the lion's share of that traffic, and that they will continue, as long as those conditions exist, to get the lion's share of that traffic.

The traffic in the Philippine Islands as a whole is a very large traffic, and yet up to this time, while our traffic has been increasing from year to year, we are getting but a very limited portion of the trade of the Philippine Islands.

I say up to this time we are getting a very limited portion of the traffic from the Philippine Islands. It is perfectly natural that if Great Britain wants that trade she should take it to her ports at a less rate than she is willing to bring it to our shores. Is it not perfectly natural that if Japan wants that trade, and Japan is the only nation furnishing ocean transportation, Japan will take that trade to her ports instead of bringing it to our ports, and if she brings it to our ports by force of

necessity, she would charge a higher rate upon that than she charges for transportation of the same thing to her own ports?

So I say that we have this condition confronting us with reference to one of our own possessions. We can not give the people of those islands a fair opportunity to trade with us and we can not ourselves enjoy a fair opportunity to trade with them, because they buy their transportation from other countries that are interested in diverting the trade from this country to their own country, and that will continue.

Now, it may be that under present conditions it will be impossible for private capital to operate ships between this country and the Philippines at a profit. It may be under present conditions that it will be impossible for the United States Government to do that, because when they get to these ports, whether the ship be under private control or under Government control, it meets the competition of Japan and the competition of Europe. But suppose we eliminate that; suppose we send our ships there in private ownership or in Government ownership in certain quest of that trade and there is no possible competition between those ships and foreign ships. We send them there with the fixed purpose that we will give to those people as favorable trade conditions as ships of any other country will give to them. What is the result? The result will be that not only the present traffic between that country and this country will all be brought in American bottoms, but that traffic between this country and our possession across the sea will greatly increase as the result of the concentration of that traffic, and as a result of the increase of that traffic, it seems to me, it is reasonable to suppose that we will build up a sufficient trade between this country and the Philippines to make it profitable for American ships engaged in coastwise trade to operate at a profit.

The committee considered the question very maturely and very thoroughly. It is the hope of the committee that by extending our coastwise laws to the Philippine Islands, by cutting off competition between our ships and foreign ships for this trade, we will be able in a short time to build up a trade sufficient to justify private capital in investing money in that enterprise. But if we can not do that, it seems to me it would be a gross disregard of our duty to those people if we did not see to it that they are furnished by the Government of the United States, even if it entails some little loss to the people of the United States, an equal opportunity to trade with this country to that which they enjoy in their trade with other countries of the world.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for the splendid statement he has made. He has covered the whole question fully and completely.

I wish to call attention briefly to what Canada is doing with reference to trade between Canada, China, and Japan. Her own estimate for 1919 was \$253,333.34. That comes out of the Treasury of Canada in direct aid to her shipping lines. The estimate for 1920 is \$253,333.34.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to a very significant statement on page 101 of this official document. This is with reference to a \$200,000 item for traffic between Canada and France:

Freight rates. The rates charged for freight to or from any Canadian port included in this contract shall not exceed the rates charged by regular passenger steamers of the same class to or from New York, Boston, or Portland, and the minister may at any time revise the rates if he deem it advisable.

In other words, the rates from Canadian ports shall not exceed those from Boston and New York. Then listen:

No discrimination of any kind shall be made against Canadian merchants or shippers, who shall always have precedence for their freight and goods over all other merchants and shippers.

They propose to look after their interests. That is what I want us to do with reference to our interests.

Now, Mr. President, just a word with regard to section 11, which has been adopted, which provides for a fund for aiding private parties to build ships and for building the ships by the Government if that becomes necessary. The Senator from New Jersey is not opposed to, in fact he favors, creating a fund to be used in aiding private parties in the building of ships. I can not see the justice of a discrimination. We probably have a situation on the Pacific coast very different from that on the Atlantic coast, and it emphasizes, to my mind, at any rate, the need of a larger board. The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Minnesota think the present board is too large, being composed of seven. The Senator from Minnesota would make it much smaller; he says we should have one, two, or three commissioners who will represent the whole country. The trouble is that when you get the three they do not represent the whole country; they do not know anything about the conditions in certain sections of the country; they do not know the needs of the Pacific as compared with the Atlantic, and they represent only the Atlantic, and probably only a small part of that.



Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will.

Mr. RANDELL. It seems to me it would be just as apropos for us to have the various States of the South and the Pacific, for instance, represented by two or three Senators as to have our immense commerce on the Pacific, the Gulf, and the South Atlantic represented by three men, probably all taken from one city. We have got to have representatives from every section of this great Republic on our Shipping Board, exactly as we have in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate, in order to have the interests of the respective localities properly looked after.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly, that is true. One of the most important provisions of this bill is that increasing the board and distributing it over the different sections of the country. There will be no log rolling, but the interests and shipping needs of every section will be considered. A broad, national policy will be carried out in a broad, national way and a merchant marine will be created that will serve every interest and every section. If this proposition simply involved the selling of ships, the getting rid of ships, if it were simply a liquidating proposition, as a prominent gentleman who is a member of the shipping force though not a member of the Shipping Board has several times designated it, then I would agree with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Jersey that one man would be better than a board of three or five or seven; but the Shipping Board is anything but a liquidating agency. Its great purpose and aim are administrative and the development of administrative policies to carry out the great policy which we declare in this bill. It will require men with knowledge of every section and of the needs of every section of the country to do what ought to be done.

Now, what is the situation on the Pacific coast? We do not have regular lines on the Pacific, such as cross the Atlantic from New York. We have the Japanese and the English and other lines controlling the business on the Pacific, but few, if any, American lines; and yet, if there is any section outside of South America where the commerce of the United States should develop and grow and expand, it is in the Pacific and in the Orient. We must have men who know the conditions and the needs and the situation there in order to work out a policy that will build up lines; and we want regular lines on the Pacific. We must have them or aliens will control the trade of the Pacific, including our own.

Mr. President, I hope, under the encouragement given in this bill, that private parties will establish such lines, but, if they do not, the lines ought not to go unestablished simply because private parties do not see sufficient profit in the enterprise to establish them and to operate ships on them. So, while it is the policy of the bill and of the committee to have private parties build all these ships and establish these lines and these routes, if they can be prevailed upon to do so, we do not propose to leave very highly desirable routes without ships.

We deem it not only wise but good governmental business to provide a way by which if there is a highly important route that should be established and private parties will not establish it, the Government agency may construct the ships and put them on the line and develop the business; develop the business at a loss, if you please; and when it gets profitable sell the line and the ships on a profitable basis to private parties and let them continue to operate them.

The people of the country will sustain a proposition of that sort. They will recognize that while they are paying a subsidy, or call it whatever you please, they are paying for the establishment and development of a business that will mean millions of dollars for the commerce of this country, the development of American shipping that will be a great asset of national defense in time of need. So, Mr. President, I am glad that the Senate has approved that section of the bill. It is one of its most important sections. Under it private parties will be aided in building the finest type of ships for trade lines they believe will be profitable, and under it the Government will see to it that important routes are established and new markets developed.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question right here?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. Simply to bring out the matter in the RECORD, I desire to ask the Senator what is the proposed policy? If I understand it correctly, in establishing these new lines, even though they are operated at a loss—and I am inclined to agree also with that policy—the Senator does not, of course, mean by that that we shall establish lines where American lines are already in operation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all.

Mr. EDGE. But simply where such lines are not running?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly; I do not imagine that the Shipping Board would think about establishing lines where American lines are already established, because we do not propose and do not desire this legislation to be used by the Shipping Board to destroy private enterprise, private industry, and private capital which has been invested. On the contrary, we want the Shipping Board to aid and sustain private energy and industry.

Now, just a word further. The Senator from Minnesota is fearful that we shall establish a great many routes that will not pay. Mr. President, we do not have the American merchant marine established as it ought to be established; we do not have the routes developed as they ought to be developed and as we should like to have them developed. This bill may not do what we hope it will do. We will do nothing if we do not try to do something. If we wait to be sure of results nothing will be done. We must take some chances. Like the Senator from Minnesota, I hope the policy proposed will be a success. I do not know, but I believe it will be. I do not believe that the Shipping Board, under the direction that we give them, will fail to carry out the intentions of the legislation, if we get the right sort of a board; and I want to say that the committee, in my judgment, is going to do what it can hereafter to see that we have the right kind of men on the Shipping Board, whether we have them now or not. We recognize the tremendous importance of the Shipping Board; we recognize that it ought to be composed of men of the highest standing and the greatest business ability and experience that we can possibly get; men who are moved by the highest motives of patriotism and the desire to build up American interests and the American merchant marine. We are going to do the best we can to aid in securing that sort of men on the Shipping Board. No Government board has a more difficult task nor a greater work to do. They are going recklessly into the establishment of new routes. They are going to look into the matter very carefully before they act. We will have to depend upon them; we will have to trust them; and we are going to give them the general outlines of the policy we want carried out and the great purpose we desire to accomplish, and then we are going to intrust them with the power to accomplish that purpose and that object.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I expected. I did not intend to speak at all but I thought it well to present the other side of the questions suggested by the able Senators from Minnesota and New Jersey. I should like to have the consideration of the bill continued for a few moments until we can finish the reading of the text of the bill as it passed the House, and then I will be willing to have it go over temporarily before we begin the consideration of the new provisions.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 16, line 7, to change the number of the section from "7" to "12"; in the same line, before the word "sold," to strike out "not" and insert "until"; in line 9, after the word "terms," to insert "and conditions"; in line 11, after the words "merchant marine," to strike out "provided the operation, charter, or lease of such vessels by the board shall be limited to the time fixed" and insert "pursuant to the policy and purposes declared in sections 1 and 5 of this act; and the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation shall continue in existence and have authority to operate vessels until all vessels are sold in accordance with the provisions of this act, the provision"; and in line 18, after "1916," to insert "to the contrary notwithstanding," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 12. That all vessels until sold shall be managed and operated by the board or chartered or leased by it on such terms and conditions as the board shall deem wise for the promotion and maintenance of an efficient merchant marine, pursuant to the policy and purposes declared in sections 1 and 5 of this act; and the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation shall continue in existence and have authority to operate vessels until all vessels are sold in accordance with the provisions of this act, the provision in section 11 of the "shipping act, 1916," to the contrary notwithstanding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 19, to change the number of the section from "8" to "13"; in line 20, before the word "property," to strike out "any" and insert "all"; in the same line, before the word "transferred," to insert "other than vessels"; in line 21, after the word "section," to strike out "2" and insert "4"; in the same line, before the word "such," to strike out "under" and insert "upon"; in line 22, after the word "may," to insert "determine and"; and in the same line, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "but completion of payment of the purchase price shall be within five years from the date of the contract of sale," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 13. That the board is further authorized to sell all property other than vessels transferred to it under section 4 upon such terms and conditions as the board may determine and prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 1, to change the number of the section from "9" to "14"; in line 3, after "1916," to insert "or by the acts specified in section 2 of this act"; in line 4, before the word "such," to strike out "save" and insert "except"; in line 6, after the word "section," to strike out "7" and insert "12"; in the same line, after "12," to strike out "of this act," and insert "hereof"; in line 7, before the word "for," to strike out "or" and insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "section," to strike out "6" and insert "10 hereof," and for the construction fund authorized in section 11 hereof"; in line 13, after "July 1," to strike out "1920" and insert "1921"; in line 16, after the word "capital," to strike out "or" and insert "and less such sums as may be needed"; in the same line, after the word "insurance," to insert "and construction"; in line 17, before the word "shall," to strike out "fund" and insert "funds"; in line 21, before the word "or," to strike out "act" and insert "acts" and in line 22, after the word "section," to strike out "1" and insert "2," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 14. That the net proceeds derived by the board prior to July 1, 1921, from any activities authorized by this act, or by the "shipping act, 1916," or by the acts specified in section 2 of this act, except such an amount as the board shall deem necessary to withhold as operating capital, for the purposes of section 12 hereof, and for the insurance fund authorized in section 10 hereof, and for the construction fund authorized in section 11 hereof, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the board and may be expended by it, within the limits of the amounts heretofore or hereafter authorized, for the construction, requisitioning, or purchasing of vessels: After July 1, 1921, such net proceeds, less such an amount as may be authorized annually by Congress to be withheld as operating capital, and less such sums as may be needed for such insurance and construction funds shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. The board shall, as rapidly as it deems advisable, withdraw investment of Government funds made during the emergency under the authority conferred by the acts or parts of acts repealed by section 2 of this act and cover the net proceeds thereof into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, to change the number of the section from "10" to "15"; in line 2, after the word "vessels," to insert "owned by the United States Government"; in line 3, after the word "furnished," to insert "by the board"; in line 5, before the word "department," to strike out "the" and insert "such"; and in the same line, after the word "department," to strike out "when such vessels are owned by the United States Government," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 15. That the board shall not require payment from the War Department for the charter hire of vessels owned by the United States Government furnished by the board from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, for the use of such department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 7, to change the number of the section from "11" to "16"; in the same line, before the word "build," to insert "purchase"; in line 8, after the word "requisition," to insert "lease"; in the same line, before the word "exchange," to strike out "or"; in the same line, before the word "houses," to insert "or otherwise acquire"; in line 9, before the word "buildings," to strike out "or"; in the same line, before the word "land," to strike out "to purchase or requisition"; in line 15, after the word "is," to strike out "suspended" and insert "hereby terminated"; in line 16, after the words "for the," to strike out "repairs"; in line 21, before the word "such," to insert "all"; in line 22, before the word "such," to insert "all," and in same line, after the word "practicable," to insert "consistent with good business and the best interests of the United States," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 16. That all authorization to purchase, build, requisition, lease, exchange, or otherwise acquire houses, buildings, or land under the act entitled "An act to authorize and empower the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to purchase, lease, requisition, or otherwise acquire, and to sell or otherwise dispose of improved or unimproved lands, houses, buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1918, is hereby terminated: *Provided, however,* That expenditures may be made under said act for the repair of houses and buildings already constructed, and the completion of such houses or buildings as have heretofore been contracted for or are under construction, if considered advisable, and the board is authorized and directed to dispose of all such properties or the interest of the United States in all such properties at as early a date as practicable, consistent with good business and the best interests of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. An executive session is desired, and I will not ask that the Secretary read further at this time. I understand, however, the Senator from New Jersey wishes to occupy the floor for a few moments.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I did not wish to interrupt further until the reading of the provisions of the bill as passed by the House had been completed, but I do not want the impression to be permitted to remain or any misunderstanding to arise as to my view of the policy of the Government in aiding the construction of new vessels as compared to the actual appropri-

tion of money for the building of new vessels. I desire to say merely a word in reference to that matter. I consider absolutely consistent the position agreeing with the one policy and not with the other. When we loan money for the construction of necessary new ships we are simply advancing our credit; we are not accumulating additional property to be disposed of in some way or other, probably at a loss, at a later date. In order to follow out the policy which the Senator from Washington so eloquently announced to-day of building a merchant marine, I think it is one of the most businesslike policies of the Government to loan its credit when it is being absolutely secured and protected under the terms of the act, and quite a different policy from actually expending money and having the property on hand. While I offered no amendment, I stated at the time that I believed in a \$50,000,000 limit, and that the section was not compulsory. It simply placed the matter in the hands of the board, and left it optional with the board. I would not attempt to amend the section; but I do think there is a distinct difference between loaning credit and spending our own money, and thus having the goods on hand.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 11, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10, 1920.*

##### MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

Edmund Platt, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board, vice Albert Strauss, resigned.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James H. Hughes, jr., of Wilmington, Del., to be United States attorney, district of Delaware, vice Charles F. Curley, term expired.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Martin F. Farry, of Wilmington, Del., to be United States marshal, district of Delaware. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

##### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Joseph Oker to be register of the land office at Helena, Mont., his present term expiring June 30, 1920. (Reappointment.)

Henry Alexander Porter to be register of the land office at Vancouver, Wash., his present term expiring June 1, 1920. (Reappointment.)

##### PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

###### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

###### To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. James P. Jervy, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1920.

###### To be lieutenant colonel.

Maj. Albert E. Waldron, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1920.

###### To be major.

Capt. Carey H. Brown, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1920.

###### CAVALRY ARM.

###### To be lieutenant colonel.

Maj. Abraham G. Lott, Cavalry, from May 5, 1920.

###### To be major.

Capt. Christian A. Bach, Cavalry, from May 5, 1920.

###### COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

###### To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Donald W. Sawtelle, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

##### PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Col. Harry Lee to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of March, 1920.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10, 1920.*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Dennis B. Lucey to be United States attorney, northern district of New York.

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Daniel W. Craddock to be receiver of public moneys at Seattle, Wash.



COAST GUARD.  
To be captains.

Fletcher W. Brown.  
Henry Coyle.  
Robert Donohue.  
Frank J. Gorman.  
Lloyd V. Kleihorn.  
Gordon W. MacLane.  
Earl G. Rose.  
Edward H. Smith.  
Elmer F. Stone.  
Carl C. von Paulsen.  
John E. Whitbeck.

POSTMASTERS.  
ARIZONA.

Leonard C. Parke, Chandler.  
Andrew R. Tipton, Clarkdale.  
Nancy M. Dermont, Metcalf.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles H. Coffey, jr., Gonzales.  
George A. Debenedetti, Half Moon Bay.  
Winifred M. Whitney, Oceanside.  
Calla Winger, Orcutt.  
William J. Martin, Salinas.  
Alfred Gourdier, Torrance.  
Florence Stone, Tustin.  
Robert W. Walker, Vallejo.

IDAHO.

Arthur H. Potsch, Genesee.

MONTANA.

Charles W. Allison, Bainville.  
George C. Core, Choteau.  
Andrew N. Smith, Columbia Falls.  
Jacob Z. Bruegger, Culbertson.  
Avory W. Dehnert, Denton.  
Mathew H. Casey, Kremlin.  
George H. Wood, Malta.  
Charles A. Pennell, Manhattan.  
John W. Lister, Missoula.  
Wade J. Hubbell, Poplar.  
Frances W. Tarwater, Saco.  
Burton S. Adams, Sidney.  
Claude C. Alexander, Stanford.  
William Fraser, Three Forks.  
Adolph B. Horstman, Whitefish.  
Thomas E. Devore, Whitehall.

NEW JERSEY.

George Coleman, Delanco.  
Ida H. Collom, Pemberton.

OHIO.

Jerome H. C. Goodhart, Brewster.  
Harry C. Parrett, Continental.  
Charles E. Cramer, Fredericksburg.  
Don B. Stanley, Lowell.  
George H. Mounts, Salem.  
William R. Hatfield, West Milton.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Rixey, Rosslyn.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 10, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of law and order, peace and equity, justice and mercy, truth and purity, whose love reaches the farthest star in the vast universe and would enter in and possess the most forlorn and lonely soul, control our minds, direct our ways, and bring us with all the world in harmony with the eternal plans Thou hast ordained. Under the divine leadership of Thy son, Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 8, 1920, was read and approved.

### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, who comes from the old Lexington district in Virginia, is present and wishes to qualify. His credentials are with the Clerk.

Thereupon Mr. DREWRY, accompanied by Mr. Flood, appeared before the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to Mr. DREWRY.

### SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil bill, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insane of Alaska: For care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska, including transportation and other expenses, \$115,000: *Provided*, That authority is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to pay from this appropriation to the Sanitarium Co. of Portland, Oreg., not to exceed \$520 per capita per annum for the care and maintenance of Alaskan insane patients during the fiscal year 1921.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that some provision would be made and carried in this bill in regard to the insane from Alaska, to provide for these insane to be returned to Alaska, or, if citizens of Alaska and found in the States of the Pacific Northwest, that they shall be sent to the sanitarium at Portland. Legislation is asked for to cure that condition. I hope that the time will come when we shall have a sanitarium for the insane in Alaska.

As it is now, a citizen of Alaska found insane in the States can not be sent to the Morningside Asylum at Portland for the reason that that citizen has not been adjudged insane in Alaska. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for the education and support of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska; erection, repair, and rental of school buildings; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees; and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, \$275,000: *Provided*, That no person employed hereunder as special agent or inspector, or to perform any special or unusual duty in connection herewith shall receive as compensation exceeding \$200 per month, in addition to actual traveling expenses and per diem not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence, when absent on duty from his designated and actual post of duty: *Provided further*, That of said sum not exceeding \$7,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee, in connection with this paragraph in regard to education in Alaska, whether or not the subject of education could not be brought closer home, say here in the District of Columbia, and if the chairman at this time would permit us, without raising a point of order against it, to offer an amendment to this paragraph to provide for what is known as the teachers' bonus of \$500 for the teachers of the District of Columbia? Many of the teachers here get less than \$900 per year salary.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, that would not be germane to this item. The gentleman understands that this education that is carried on by the Department of the Interior in Alaska is for the native children.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I know it is subject to a point of order; but the urgency of the matter is so great, the need of it is so

great just now to save the schools of the District of Columbia, that I thought possibly the chairman would permit it.

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman will agree that the committee having charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill went a long way, so far as increasing the pay of the teachers is concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. They had a long amendment, but after we passed it it did not amount to much increase for the teachers.

Mr. GOOD. I think it did. It requires the additional expenditure of about \$750,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. The teachers are urging Congress right now for some immediate action, claiming that they have no means whatever to carry them through the summer months. I heard a distinguished educator in the House the other day say, "Oh, let them go to work and farm themselves out during the summer months in useful work."

I want to say right now that when a teacher spends nine months of the year in the schoolroom she is entitled to a little recreation in the summer time. If the teachers are going to be kept fit to teach the youth of the land during the rest of the year, they ought to have some time off in the summer.

Mr. GOOD. I could not agree to an amendment of that kind; that is not germane.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of it?

Mr. GOOD. I have been very sympathetic in my attitude toward the teachers' pay. I think the pay of the ordinary clerk in Washington is in most cases a good deal higher at present than the pay of school-teachers.

Mr. BLANTON. The pay of the idle negro janitor in a department in Washington is much higher to-day than that of the highly trained white lady school-teacher.

Mr. GOOD. In the subcommittee in charge of the deficiency bill—

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on this discussion on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not against education, is he?

Mr. SANFORD. Of course not; but I make the point of order against this discussion.

Mr. BLANTON. Let it be charged, then, against the gentleman that he is opposed even to a discussion of the subject. Let the teachers get after him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reindeer for Alaska: For support of reindeer stations in Alaska and instruction of Alaskan natives in the care and management of reindeer, \$6,400: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to sell such of the male reindeer belonging to the Government as he may deem advisable and to use the proceeds in the purchase of female reindeer belonging to missions and in the distribution of reindeer to natives in those portions of Alaska in which reindeer have not yet been placed and which are adapted to the reindeer industry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 108, line 8. After the word "industry," add a new paragraph, "That there shall be paid to each teacher in the District of Columbia a bonus of \$500 for the school year of 1919-20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 108, line 8, after the word "industry," insert a new paragraph, to read as follows: "That there shall be paid to each teacher in the District of Columbia a bonus of \$500 for the school year of 1919-20."

Mr. GOOD. To that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the paragraph preceding this one to which I offered the amendment we provide for education in Alaska to the amount \$275,000. We do not stop there. That is all right, however, and I am in favor of every dollar of it. You will never find me, as long as I am in the House, voting to reduce appropriations for education of the people one single dollar, because I am in favor of educating them to a blue-sky limit.

But, I say, we do not stop there; we go on further, and in the paragraph preceding this we provide that the Commissioner of Education shall expend \$6,400 on the management of reindeer in Alaska, and so forth. Now, I want to ask my colleague if there is a single reason on the face of the earth that we can offer for not paying the teachers of the District of Columbia this little, measly amount of a \$500 bonus when many of them are now getting less than \$900 per year?

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman is asking me, I will tell the gentleman what I think about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I think in the past the teachers in the District of Columbia were the worst paid teachers in the United States. I always favored good compensation for the teachers.

They all know that I have, not only here but all over the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time.

Mr. MADDEN. I will get the gentleman more time. I favored the pension for them, which they were justly entitled to. I favored the increased compensation provided for in the District bill, amounting to 50 or 100 per cent. They have got that. They come now and ask for a bonus of \$500. I am against that; I think there is a limit beyond which we ought not to go.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that there is in the District now a young lady whom I know who is highly educated, who taught school in the high schools of Texas, one of the best teachers that you will find anywhere in the country, who is teaching in your District schools here right now on a salary of less than \$100 a month. Why should she do it? She has got to stop. She told me the other day that she absolutely could not afford to do it; that she will have to resign her position.

Mr. HICKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HICKEY. What salary did this young lady receive in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I think she received more than \$100 per month, but she came to the District of Columbia, like other people come, for the advantages that a young person can receive here in an educational way.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If she is such a good teacher, is there anything to keep her from going down to Texas and getting \$400 or \$500 or \$2,000 increase?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I will tell you what is the matter; you are trying to force every teacher in the District of Columbia to join the trade-union, which would be an everlasting disgrace to their profession; and when you do it you will not find a man here who will stand up and vote against their demands. Every one of you who talks against it now will be found jumping up here and voting for everything that you are called upon to do in the name of unions.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GOOD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that next year the lowest-grade teacher in the District of Columbia will receive \$1,200 and a bonus of \$240?

Mr. BLANTON. But what are you going to do about this year and the summer months in front of them, when they have got to live, just like you and I? They can not pay their debts on promises for next year. They can not pay for their meat and bread and board and lodging on legislative promises of what is to come next year.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman's amendment does not take care of this year.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes, it does. It is for the school year of 1919-20. They will get it immediately. What you want to do is to force them to join the union, and then when Samuel Gompers comes up here and puts Morrison in the gallery and his cohorts around here call on you, you are going to give them what they want, and you know it. Why don't you act without being compelled to act?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the effect of the amendment is to increase salaries not fixed by law, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill when the item which was passed over Saturday is going to be taken up?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman means the item with reference to the reclamation project?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I have not had time to examine into the merits of the matter yet.

Mr. GANDY. It will be taken up at the end of the bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; at the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Park Service: Director, \$4,500; assistant director, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; editor, \$2,000; draftsman, \$1,800; junior draftsman, \$1,440; accountant, \$1,800; clerks—3 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 1 of class 1, 1 \$1,020, 2 at \$900 each; messenger, \$600; in all, for park service in the District of Columbia, \$28,260.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr.



Good] what is the meaning of the terms, clerks of class 4, clerks of class 3, clerks of class 2, and clerks of class 1?

Mr. GOOD. A clerk of class 4 receives a salary of \$1,800, a clerk of class 3 receives a salary of \$1,600, a clerk of class 2 receives a salary of \$1,400, and a clerk of class 1 receives a salary of \$1,200. Without other specifications, appropriations are made for their employment under the classification law.

Mr. HARRELD. Is that provided in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. That is provided in the general law in regard to classification.

Mr. HARRELD. I notice that there was expended for this purpose in 1920, \$22,220, and we propose now to increase it to \$28,260, and to provide for three extra clerks, one of class 3, one of class 2, and one of class 1. I should like to know what is the necessity for increasing this clerical force at this time, when we are trying to economize?

Mr. GOOD. We gave four extra clerks—that is, a junior draftsman, an accountant, one clerk of class 3, and one clerk of class 1.

The director of the park service felt that there was no place where more economy could be effected than by giving them the clerical force here that was required to look after the national parks. They were having some trouble with regard to their accounts. They get in accounts from all of the national parks, and here is an appropriation of about \$1,000,000 a year for the national parks.

Mr. HARRELD. Approximately \$904,000.

Mr. GOOD. It is approximately \$1,000,000 a year. The committee felt that with an appropriation of that kind we could not be too careful in the matter of accounts. The director thought that greater economies would be effected if they could keep their work current, if they could keep up their affairs in a businesslike way; that at the present time their force was so small that they were not able to keep their work current and to look after the national forests.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the increase in the appropriations is only \$157,000 more than it was last year.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I have stated to the gentleman just what the situation is. I could state more if it would not show how stingy we have been in this regard and had made it necessary for the director to pay some of the clerks out of his own pocket.

Mr. HARRELD. Does it take three more clerks to handle \$157,000 more than they had last year?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have said to the gentleman that the director states that their work is way behind now. I have tried to explain the situation.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to ask about this editor at \$2,000. I withdraw my pro forma amendment and make a point of order against the item "editor, \$2,000."

Mr. GOOD. The point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. Of course debate having taken place on the pro forma amendment, a point of order would not lie against the paragraph.

Mr. HARRELD. Then I move to strike out in line 21, page 108, the item "editor, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Harreld: Page 108, line 21, strike out after the figures "\$2,000" where they occur the first time the words and figures "editor, \$2,000."

Mr. HARRELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, at this time, when we have such a scarcity of print paper, I can not see the use of this expense of printing these advertisements, or whatever they are, affecting the national parks. I think it is time we began a program of real economy, appropriating only that which is necessary. I noticed the other day the statement that in 1916 we had a per capita national revenue of \$7.16, and that the per capita expenditures for that year were \$7.07. That year we were receiving more than we were expending. In the year 1919, the latest figures available, the per capita revenue was \$48.10 and the per capita expenditures were \$139.80, almost four times what our receipts were. It seems to me that this is a good place to begin economy.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the total revenue from the national parks last year amounted to \$186,000. The revenue up to the time of the hearings for this year was \$198,000, and it is estimated that the revenue for next year derived from people who visit the parks and from certain of the concessions in the parks alone will amount to \$300,000. The only way the revenue can be increased is to advertise and make known the beauties of the parks.

This item has been carried a long time. It is not a new item. The editor prepares all the literature with regard to the parks, and it seems to me the item should remain in the bill. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Interior in his administration of the National Park Service is authorized, in his discretion, to accept patented lands, rights of way over patented lands or other lands, buildings, or other property within the various national parks and national monuments, and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of the national park and monument system.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item gives the Secretary authority to accept lands for park purposes. I will ask the gentleman if there was any information before the committee concerning the possible acceptance of some of the big-tree lands? There has been a good deal of advertising, and statements have been made in the newspapers, and it is interesting to know.

Mr. GOOD. A few years ago in the Yosemite Park there were private holdings which the director of the park service desired to secure, in order to prevent persons from going into the park and maintaining on such holdings certain establishments there that might interfere very seriously with the rules and regulations and conduct of the park.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand; but the statement was made during the winter or the fall that the director of parks, and I believe former Representative Kent, contemplated making quite a donation to the Government of land that has some of the big trees upon it.

Mr. GOOD. That was in the Sequoia National Park.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was the land for additional parks or for new parks.

Mr. GOOD. This is what Mr. Mather says about that:

In the Sequoia National Park we secured the finest stand of timber, known as the Giant Forest. Congress gave us \$50,000 toward the purchase of the Giant Forest, and the National Geographic Society gave us an additional sum for that purpose. In that way we secured the largest and finest trees in the park, but there are some few stands in there now, right in the heart of the park, on which we are getting options. We hope that we will be able to obtain private donations, or we may come to Congress with requests to exchange public lands of equal value for lands within the national park. I think that if we can get this worked out we can get the private titles extinguished without making it too much of a burden on the Treasury, and, perhaps, there will be none at all.

The director goes on to state that he is at work trying to secure donations from individuals of certain tracts of land. Only recently he advised me that he secured an option of 40 acres of big trees in one of the forests—I have forgotten which one—and then went to a large manufacturer, who took up the option and holds the land and is ready to give it to the park. It is land within the park—the park entirely surrounds it—and I think the director is doing a very splendid work in trying to get these private holdings within the boundaries of the park all conveyed to the Government of the United States without the Government having to purchase them. In the same way he is adding to the attractiveness of the parks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I quite agree with the gentleman. I think Mr. Mather is a great asset to the Government.

Mr. GOOD. I think so myself.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Really a wonderful man.

The Clerk read as follows:

Glacier National Park, Mont.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and to the international boundary, including not exceeding \$1,000 for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$95,000.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to get some information. I notice that the appropriation made for the Glacier National Park in 1916 was \$75,000; in 1920, \$85,000; and in 1921, \$95,000, it being an increase of \$20,000 over that of 1916 and \$10,000 over that of last year. I would like to have some information why it is necessary to have these increases.

Mr. GOOD. The regular appropriation for the current year was \$85,000, with a deficiency of \$62,000 and a further deficiency of \$19,849. The deficiencies had to do largely with the protection of the forests from fire. The amount of the estimate was \$293,000. We carry in the bill \$95,000, which is \$10,000 more than last year. The gentleman complains because it is more than last year, but I want to remind him that in 1917 the appropriation was \$110,000; the appropriation for 1918

was \$115,000. The States have been increasing and improving the highways to the national parks, and the director desired very much to improve the highways in the park. However, the director, after going over this matter very carefully, I think, became convinced that at this time, because of the very high price demanded for materials for road building and for labor, the Government was getting only about 40 cents on the dollar for the money expended; at least that is the judgment of the committee. What the committee has done is to cut these items down to a maintenance item pure and simple. The gentleman may say that it is \$10,000 more than last year. The testimony is that the increase in the wages and materials is practically 20 per cent more than last year, and with the present appropriation it is doubted if we will get as much in the way of maintenance as we had with an appropriation of \$85,000.

Mr. HARRELD. I notice that the appropriation for parks in 1916 was \$242,000 for these same 17 parks, and that this year it amounts to \$904,000, approximately. Will there ever be a time when these parks will be revenue producers rather than an expense?

Mr. GOOD. Out of the appropriation of this year of \$900,000 the director estimates the total increase will amount to \$300,000. That is a growth of about \$185,000 for the last fiscal year. I submit to the gentleman that shows a very healthy growth. The people are beginning to appreciate the national parks, and they will appreciate them more and more just as we are able, as I hope in the near future we will be able, to do something more for the national parks than we have this year. By improving our national parks we will keep many American tourists at home. If any complaint can be made, I think it would be because the committee cut this appropriation as much as it did. It cut it with one end in view, and that was to not appropriate money at a time when we were getting only about 40 cents on the dollar for the amount appropriated, but to postpone the opening up of roads and trails until a more normal condition exists with regard to costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood in asking these questions. No one is more in favor of increasing appropriations for parks than I am, but I think at the present time these things ought to be limited to actual necessities. I am asking these questions for information; I am not opposing national parks, because in a few minutes I am going to ask that I be given additional appropriations for a park. I do not want to be considered inconsistent. I have every confidence in the Appropriations Committee. I know how well it has served in holding down expenses of government during these times, when economy should be the watchword. I have not a word of criticism, but I felt that the record of this House should show more fully the necessity for the various increases made in this bill over those of last year. I have heard the explanation of the chairman. It is satisfactory.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] suggested that possibly there ought to be a considerable increase in the receipts for the use of parks, and some people might think that the gentleman from Oklahoma believes that parks should be self-supporting, although I am quite sure that that is not his policy.

Mr. HARRELD. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. East Potomac Park, in the city of Washington, brings in no revenue to the Government. Rock Creek Park, in the city of Washington, brings in no revenue to the Government. In my city the expenses of the parks amount to a good many times the total appropriations in this bill for the maintenance of the national parks, but those parks produce no revenue at all. Yet they much more than pay for the expense of their maintenance. If there is any one thing that is of value to people who work it is to have some recreation parks. Parks are maintained not so much for those who can afford to pay for their use as they are for those who can not afford to pay high expenses in order to make use of them. I am in favor of parks and in favor of the use of parks. I believe that every citizen who goes into a beautiful park and enjoys a rest and recreation amid the beauties of the park makes himself or herself a better citizen of the country. There is nothing, in my judgment, of more value than good parks, both local and national. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to assess and collect from physicians who desire to prescribe the hot waters from the Hot Springs Reservation reasonable charges for the exercise of such

privilege, including fees for examination and registration; and he is also authorized to assess and collect from bath attendants and masseurs operating in all bathhouses receiving hot water from the reservation reasonable charges for the exercise of such privileges. The moneys received from the exercise of this authority shall be used in the protection and improvement of the said reservation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. The language of this paragraph seems to be rather broad. It gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to assess and collect from physicians who desire to prescribe the hot water from the Hot Springs Reservation reasonable charges, and so forth, for the exercise of such privilege. Suppose a physician in the city of Washington had a patient for whom he desires to prescribe that he shall go to Hot Springs and take the water, how is the Secretary of the Interior going to levy a license fee on that physician?

Mr. GOOD. I think he can do that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I would like to know how.

Mr. GOOD. The director says he can do it. They require now of every physician before he is authorized to prescribe treatment that he have a license to give a prescription. It is all on a Government reservation, and the Government has the right to regulate practices on its own reservation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; practices on the reservation, probably true; but it is not confined to that. A physician in Washington can be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior in writing a prescription. It is not confined to physicians at the Hot Springs.

Mr. GOOD. It is the only place where it will have any application.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, I think it is the only place where it will be practicable to apply it, but I have no confidence whatever in some Secretary of the Interior—not the present one, in whom I have all confidence—endeavoring to determine what shall be done about the use of water at the Hot Springs and what shall be done elsewhere.

Mr. GOOD. It is purely a matter of administration.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not see upon what theory, by the way, physicians at Hot Springs are to be assessed if they want to prescribe the water there.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Suppose a physician in the city of Washington should prescribe a patient should go to the Glacier Mountain Park, for instance, and ride horseback, he may be charged a license under the same theory?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly; on the same theory, he could be.

Mr. GOOD. This is only intended to apply and will only apply to the physicians who are practicing there and persons who go there for treatment. These waters are not sent out, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, but people are sent there.

Mr. GOOD. They are sent there, and when they get there they go to the physician who knows about the medicinal quality of the water of the various springs. Now, an examination is made of the person and then the physician gives him a prescription as to the waters they should use and how they shall be used. Mr. Mather, who appeared before the committee in behalf of the item, feels this is necessary. I know very little about the practice—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would mean additional fees for going to Hot Springs, because that is what it amounts to, of course.

Mr. GOOD. No; they say not. The director says it is absolutely in the interest of the protection to the man who goes to the Hot Springs, and the doctors have no objection whatever to paying this fee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Perhaps the doctors there would prefer to pay the fee to keep some other doctor from giving a prescription?

Mr. GOOD. No; it keeps out the quacks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not see how this keeps out the quacks. What Secretary of the Interior is going to determine whether a physician can prescribe these waters—

Mr. GOOD. Of course he does not allow everyone to prescribe the waters—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He is trying now, so far as that goes.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This merely extends that authority.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is for the purpose not only of doing that, but to make charges against the physicians and make charges against the masseurs and make charges against everybody who goes down there to do any work.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman submit to an interruption?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. I have not studied the technical language here, but I do understand the law requires the physicians to stand



an examination; in other words, must be registered. This is for the purpose of protecting the patients who go there from being victims of quack physicians, and they are guarded very closely, and they bar and strike from the rolls physicians who are not reputable and not attending properly to their patients. As I recall, when people go there they can only take particular waters under the advice of a physician. It is not safe to take some of them except on advice of a physician. And now the charge assessed against the registration of these bathhouse attendants is to protect the patients against improper attention in these bathhouses. I do not think the intention is to undertake to provide revenue out of it, but solely for the purpose of paying the expenses of registration and of protecting patients who go there. It is considered to be for the benefit of the patients, and it is not to exclude anybody who has knowledge or is qualified to prescribe the waters. Now, I have not examined the language, as I have said—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Probably the gentleman from Arkansas knows in reference to this, but it seems to me as if it would be nonsense. However, I withdraw the point of order. If the people of Arkansas want it, why, of course—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to make one statement. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Representative from that district does not happen to be on the floor just at this particular moment. I am very familiar with the situation at the Hot Springs and know a great many people there, and the impression I have gotten is that at the present time these springs are being taken care of and being run better than they have ever been before to protect the people who go there for their health from all parts of the earth. The present superintendent of the springs is admitted by all reputable physicians to be trying to protect the people who go there in every way, and whenever he finds a doctor who he thinks is not a reputable physician, who is not acting properly, then he looks after him and gets after him and has him brought up, and frequently doctors have come to Washington to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, and I have not heard any complaint of this arrangement except from those who claim they have been charged with being incompetent; but the general impression that I get from people there is that the present management is better than ever before and that the people who visit that place are better protected.

They can go to the office of the superintendent on the avenue there, and they can get a list of registered physicians, and they can go to any physician on that list and rest assured that he is a reputable man and will not make improper charges or neglect them, but will see that they get the treatment necessary. The object at the springs now is to try to protect the people who go there.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not exceeding \$800 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of a motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle for use of the superintendent and park employees in connection with general park work, \$40,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the National Park Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the National Park Service. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$6,000.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HARRELD: Strike out lines 9 and 10, page 112, and substitute therefor the words "Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and extension of sewer system, including the purchase of a wagon and team of mules for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with the national-park work and the purchase of provender therefor, \$9,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am actuated in asking for this increased appropriation for this little park because it happens to be in my district, and because of the necessity of the situation. I was in this park some five months ago, and it is deplorable to see the condition which exists there. It is a nice park, something on the order of Rock Creek Park in

Washington. If the same amount of money was spent on that park that is expended in Rock Creek Park it would be a much more beautiful one; and it has this in addition to recommend it, that it is a health resort. There are to be found there some of the finest sulphur springs in the United States, and perhaps the finest bromide water in the United States. This bromide water was so valued by Uncle Sam that a few years ago he kept a guard over the spring and would not allow anyone to carry water away, because it was so valuable in the treatment of nervous diseases. Nobody could take it away, but could go there and drink it by the cup. Of course, lately that has not been kept up. This park was formerly known as Sulphur Springs National Park, and was established way back yonder when that country belonged to the Indians, for the benefit of the Indians, and since the whites have settled up that country they, too, have been coming in their wagons and their cars to drink of that water and recover their health. So it has that advantage over these other parks about which we are talking. It is not only a pleasure park but a health resort, 1 of 2 of the 17 parks included in this bill which in addition to being pleasure parks are also health resorts.

Right here I want to say that I am not opposed to beautifying and improving our parks. The questions I asked were simply meant to bring out the importance of these appropriations, and I will go my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] one better, and say that I hope the time will come when we will not only be able to do the right thing with these parks in the way of improving and beautifying them, but we shall appropriate money to build roads and connect them up with highways that will make them more accessible to the poor of this country who need these parks, as my friend from Illinois said.

As I said, I visited this park in November and I was struck with the deplorable conditions there. The pavilions over these springs—and there are several of them that the Government built at great expense—are absolutely rotting down. The 5 miles of hard-surface road that the Government built in the park is going to wreck because they have not a team of mules with which to improve it.

Formerly the Government appropriated \$17,500 for this park, and then it dropped to \$10,000, and then to \$8,000. In 1916 and 1917 the appropriation was \$8,000, and during the war it was dropped to \$6,000, and for the last two years there had been appropriated \$6,000. It is the only park in the list for which the appropriation has gradually decreased. The others have all increased until, as against \$242,000 in 1916, there is this year being appropriated \$904,000. But this is the only park in the list where there has been a decrease.

I found the conditions there deplorable in this, that there is only one available camp ground that can be used by these people who come there in their wagons and cars. It belongs to the city of Sulphur, which lies alongside of this park, and I found when I was there last fall that this camp ground had been closed to the public because of insanitary conditions; and hundreds of people coming to that park were obliged to turn around and go back home because they could not find a place on which to camp. So I ask you to give an appropriation of \$2,000, which is necessary to connect up the sewerage, which is already in this park, with this camp ground, so that the people who come there this summer may be able to use that camp ground in enjoying the privileges of that park for the benefit of their health.

Now, when I got here last fall I found that the superintendent had already made his recommendation of \$6,000 again for this year. You will understand I did not get here until the 1st of December, after a special election. I went to work immediately and tried to get the superintendent to increase his recommendation for this appropriation. In that case I asked for \$5,000 more. He would not agree to increase the recommendation, because he had already made it, but he did write a letter to the Committee on Appropriations, in which he said that \$5,200 could be spent to very fine advantage on this park. I have a copy of that letter. I do not know whether that constitutes a recommendation or not; but, anyway, the committee did not see fit to follow it, and I presume they had reasons for it. I am not impugning its motives. The fact is that both the committee and its chairman are entitled to much credit for the efforts they have put forward in the interest of economy—I have done my best to assist them in their plan of economy—but it is not economy to fail to keep up improvements that have already been made, or to refuse appropriations that are actually necessary, as in this case.

I want to say here now that I want to pay a compliment to Mr. Mather. I think that he is the man of all men that we should have as superintendent of these great parks of ours. The only trouble is that he does not know anything of the conditions in this particular park, and therefore recommends a

smaller appropriation than is really necessary. We need a larger appropriation to keep up the park and its four or five pavilions and its 4 or 5 miles of road, with this creek that needs to be kept clear of debris, and the approaches to the bridges are washed out and should be repaired. And all of this is impossible to do unless this commission is given a team of mules. They are so poor that they have not got even a team of mules to haul off the brush and to cut the weeds and repair the 5 or 6 miles of road. The superintendent, who is a brother of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], told me that he took his own team of mules and worked in that park to cut down the weeds and to make repairs for three months last year without cost to the Government, but that he could not do it again this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman. This park is a matter of old controversy in this House. For a number of years this House has tried to give this park away, but nobody would take it. Now, I presume we are going to keep it.

Mr. HARRELD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question right there. Does he not think that if we are going to keep it we ought to do something for it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was what I was going to get at. If we are going to keep it, I think we ought to do something with it. I did not catch the full import of the gentleman's amendment, but, as I understand, all he has asked for is a team of mules.

Mr. HARRELD. No. I was asking for an increase of \$3,000 only; \$1,000 of which is to be used in the purchase of the team of mules to do this work and for the purchase of provender and \$2,000 for the extension of the sewer system.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. A team of mules for operation would involve a good deal of expense. They need material and labor. They have not got their material and labor. So far as I know the appropriation of \$6,000 is nearly all used for salaries.

Mr. HARRELD. It provides for three laborers, but they have got nothing to work with.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They would not have much more to work with if all they had additional was the team of mules.

Mr. MacGREGOR. They are to be intelligent mules. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRELD. They would have \$1,140 out of the original appropriation of \$6,000, and the \$2,000 for sewer extension, which I am asking for in this amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether we ought to keep the park or not, but I guess we will have to, because no one else will take it. It is valuable for its waters. There is no park there except the waters. That is all there is to it. They have valuable medicinal waters there. I think that is admitted. Let the gentleman tell us more about it.

Mr. HARRELD. I will tell you more about it. The gentleman does not know anything about it if he thinks it is valuable for its waters only. [Laughter.] This park, as I said a while ago, when the lands of the Indian Territory were allotted among the Indians in severalty, was left there for the benefit of the Indian tribes. At that time it was not contemplated that the whites would ever settle that country. It is a beautiful little park, about 4 miles by 6 in dimensions, if I understand it aright; and I want to say right now that it rivals Rock Creek Park, right close to this city. It is in the Arbuckle Mountains, right in the middle of the mountains, and there is an ever-flowing stream through the center of it. They have two bridges over it which the Government has built. It is more heavily timbered and the valley is wider than that of Rock Creek Park out here on the outskirts of Washington. It is a park that the people get a great deal of benefit from. As I said before, it is one of the two parks that is a pleasure park and noted for its medicinal waters at the same time. Now, why should a park that is both a pleasure park and a health resort be abandoned absolutely in favor of a park which is only for pleasure?

There is another thing to be said about it: I had a talk with Mr. Mather, and he told me that his plan contemplated some day having a highway system connecting all these parks. If that plan is carried out this park will be found to be on the direct line of that highway system between the other great parks and Hot Springs, Ark.—and it is only one day's travel from Hot Springs, Ark., to this park—and in the natural course that that highway would have to take when it is built, going from Hot Springs National Park to the other parks of the Rocky

Mountains, this Platt National Park would be a good link in the chain, and I believe it ought to be preserved for that purpose if for no other.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, what sort of ills are these waters supposed to cure?

Mr. HARRELD. The sulphur water is good for stomach troubles. The bromide water is practically all the water that there is of that kind in this country; it is good for nervous diseases and is demonstrated to be very efficient in such cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRELD. This is what I want to say, gentlemen: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that Congress has been trying to get rid of this park for a long time. That is no reason why you should let it go to rack. If you want to get rid of this park, keep it up in shape until you can get rid of it. As long as the Government owns that park it ought not to absolutely ignore it. I am not asking for a great big appropriation to beautify it and make it a great pleasure resort. I am only asking for what is absolutely necessary to keep that park in shape and preserve the improvements we already have made there, and I am limiting it to only \$3,000 increase. Now, whether or not you want to preserve that park, whether or not you want to carry out the plan of finally getting rid of that park, so long as we have got it I believe it is our duty to preserve it and protect it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not understand that this amendment would be subject to a point of order, although the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] has reserved a point of order against it.

Mr. GOOD. The entire item is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. The entire item is?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Then are not all the items for all these parks subject to a point of order?

I want to say to the gentleman in reference to this park, after what my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] has already said, that this is one of the beauty spots of the Southwest. It is one of the places that the Indian tribes of Oklahoma have where they go and camp and get the benefits of the medicinal waters in that park. I want to say to you that if people who have never enjoyed the benefits of this bromide water—and there are thousands of them in the United States—could only get the benefits of that water, there would be less nervous disease and nervous trouble in the country. That bromide water is a water which, when drunk and bathed in, will enable nervous people who are troubled with insomnia and can not sleep to so improve that in three or four days they can sleep with the peaceful slumber of a baby. It settles and quiets their nerves, and the water is in such great demand that the United States Government permits the allowance of only half a gallon to each applicant each day. The water is limited in quantity. It is said by those who have examined it to be better than the waters of Carlsbad, and yet, because it is away out in Oklahoma, away in the Southwest, where no money has been expended to advertise it and where the superintendents of parks have not visited it, and because it has not attracted the wealthy people of the country to go there, there is this talk about small appropriations and this talk about abandoning this park. Why, gentlemen, let me say to you that this park, while it is small and situated in a new State, can yet be enjoyed by any American citizen and can be made more enjoyable than some of these parks upon which you spend thousands of dollars, because there are no large concessions to hotel people and transportation people which require high charges, such as obtain in those better-known national parks which are visited only by the wealthy, who for temporary purposes are confining their migratory activities to the scenery afforded in the United States instead of going abroad.

This park is a place where the American Indian in his native country can go and camp in his tent and enjoy the water that nature has provided for him. These children of the forests and plains can not go there now, because there is not sufficient money to provide sanitary conditions for them to camp in this park. And, gentlemen, this appropriation ought not to be merely for \$3,000 additional. It ought to be for \$5,000 addi-



tional, because I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that you will not be able to do much with a team of mules on the \$3,000 that is provided here.

Sometimes here in this House I have heard some Members who are not familiar with the great West suggest that the United States Government ought to just give the West its public lands, and all these things, in order to get rid of them; that they are so much of a burden. Let me remind some of these gentlemen that the State of Oklahoma in 1917 was second in the American Union in the payment of excess-profits taxes into the Treasury of the United States. I want to say that in justice to my State. Gentlemen, I hope you will give this matter your careful consideration, and that you will give this little allowance that they have asked down there, that will do so much benefit and so much good to the people of that section of the country.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation and offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. Good for the amendment offered by Mr. HARRELD:

"Platt National Park, Okla.: Pursuant to the authority conveyed in section 64 of the act approved July 1, 1902 (Stats. L., vol. 32, p. 656), all of the land comprising the Platt National Park in the State of Oklahoma is transferred and title thereto vested in the State of Oklahoma.

"If the State of Oklahoma shall fail or refuse to accept the Platt National Park as herein authorized to be conveyed to it from the United States, the same shall be appraised and sold either by sealed proposals for the purchase of the same or by public auction after advertisement of the sale for such time as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the public interest may require, the proceeds of such sale, after payment therefrom of the expenses of making the same, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, then I will make the point of order. It is clearly legislation, and subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois just what part of the amendment his point of order is directed against?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Against all of it. The whole amendment is legislation and nothing else. Whether the original item in the bill is subject to a point of order or not, I do not undertake to say. I do not know. I do not recall. But that is only for administration of the park. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] was only in reference to the administration of the park. That is an appropriation, not legislation. It may be an appropriation not authorized by law. That has nothing to do with the question; but this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa is legislation and nothing but legislation.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is no question but what it is legislation. It is legislation under the Holman rule.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. GOOD. It is legislation to carry out the legislation that created the national parks. The section of the statute referred to in the amendment, the statute creating this park approved July 1, 1902, carries the following provision:

*Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed or held to commit the Government of the United States to any expenditure of money upon said land or the improvement thereof except as provided for herein, it being the intention of this provision that in the future the lands and improvements therein mentioned shall be conveyed by the United States to such territorial or State organization as may exist at the time when the conveyance is made.

Keeping that matter in mind, keeping in mind the statement of Mr. Mather that this was a park visited in the main by the people of Sulphur, that it was a local park, and when it was ceded to the National Government by the two tribes of Indians who owned the land—not a strip of land 4 miles by 6, as the gentleman from Oklahoma states, but a little over one section of land—it carried the express provision that the Government only took title to it until such time as the State of Oklahoma should take it back. The amendment which I have offered is in line with the provisions carried in that provision of law. The committee were perfectly willing to let the matter rest where it was and to give for this park every penny that the director had asked for simply as a maintenance proposition while the Government was holding title to the park for the town of Sulphur. But now when it comes to improving this

park and putting on other additional improvements to land that we simply hold in trust, to a park that is not national in any sense of the word and can not be made national, it seems to me stretching the authority a good deal to ask us to appropriate money for permanent improvements for that kind of a tract of land.

Mr. HARRELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRELD. I will ask the gentleman if he did not get a letter from Mr. Mather, the park commissioner, asking that \$5,200 should be appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and Mr. Mather said before the committee that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] had been to see him and wanted him to make another estimate, and he said if it was the desire of the committee to have him increase his estimate he would increase it; but the Committee on Appropriations were not asking anyone to increase his estimate. Here is a letter, and I want the Members to hear the reading of it and see if there is a Member here who would act favorably to increase this appropriation over the amount estimated on this kind of a statement.

This is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
Washington, April 9, 1920.

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GOOD: I have just received a letter from Hon. J. W. HARRELD, of Oklahoma, in which he refers to a recent hearing which the Committee on Appropriations accorded him on the question of an appropriation for Platt National Park additional to the estimate of \$6,000 submitted by the Interior Department. Mr. HARRELD feels that as a result of his presentation the committee is interested.

Of course, in view of my conversation with you several weeks ago, I do not see how I could consistently ask the Secretary to submit a formal supplemental estimate at this time, but I would add that if the committee feels disposed to act favorably on the additional sum of \$5,200 proposed by Mr. HARRELD, the National Park Service will be able to use it to very good advantage in the betterment of the park in the following manner:

Purchase of mules, feeds, etc.....	\$1,500
Purchase of garden and other small tools.....	605
Installing toilets and connecting with sewer in auto camp grounds.....	2,000
Repairing existing buildings in park.....	1,095
	5,200

Very truly, yours,

STEPHEN T. MATHER, Director.

Anyone who knows Mr. Mather knows that he was not asking for any more than \$6,000, which the committee granted him. Anyone that knows him and knows the wonderful service he has given to the Government in building up the national-park system, knows that Mr. Mather's heart was not in any proposal that would take out of the Treasury of the United States \$5,200 for this purpose. It seems to me the amendment I have offered is within the Holman rule. It is to carry out a certain proposal when the park was taken over, and that is to reconvey it to the State.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Has the President or the Secretary of the Interior recommended anything like the proposal in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GOOD. I think not.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Iowa has never visited this park?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; I never knew that the park existed until recently. I do remember some discussion on the floor of the House, but I do not think many Members in the Chamber know anything about the park. It is a State park. In my town we have a much larger park called Beaver Park, but I do not suppose that gentlemen have heard of it. We spend four or five times as much as the Government spends on this park.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman's substitute is something that he offers of his own motion, without the recommendation from any official of the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the same as the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Only my amendment is made in conformity with the statute that made provision for the taking of this park from these two tribes of Indians, or took the title to it, and which provided that nothing in the act should bind the Government to pay out any money for improvements. By this amendment I eliminate the \$6,000. The State ought to have the park if it is such a beautiful park and so great an attraction. The State ought to take some pride in it and ought to be willing to take the park back and make it a great State park.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa admittedly contains provisions of legislation. The gentleman from Iowa says, first, that

it is in order because the legislative provision is in accordance with the proviso in the act creating the national park, which provided—

That nothing in this act shall be construed or held to commit the Government of the United States to any expenditure of money on said plans of improvement therefor, except as provided herein, it being the intention of this provision that in the future the land and improvements herein mentioned shall be conveyed by the United States to such Territory, State, or organization as may exist at the time said conveyance is made.

That provision seems to the Chair to contemplate that legislation will at some time be had in accordance with this policy. But the mere fact that it contemplates legislation does not remove or change the character of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa as legislation, but confirms the Chair's opinion that the amendment is legislation.

The gentleman from Iowa also contends that the provision is in order under the Holman rule. If the first portion of the amendment were in order under the Holman rule the second portion is clearly not in order under the Holman rule, and under the rule which is to the effect that if any portion of an amendment is subject to a point of order the whole amendment is subject to a point of order, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Good) there were 37 ayes and 14 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$20,000.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 112, line 12, strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert "\$40,000."

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is with a good deal of reluctance that I present for your consideration this amendment to this appropriation bill. I sympathize deeply with the policy of the committee in its attitude in reducing appropriations for public expenditure in this bill. I think though, that this can be carried sometimes to a point where great injustice will be done. I believe that this is specially true with reference to the appropriation for the Rocky Mountain National Park carried in this bill and which the amendment I offer seeks to remedy.

Those of you who have read the hearings and know the appropriations that have been made for the several parks will recognize that the appropriation for this park is double the amount of the previous appropriations made for this park for the past five years, and they may infer that that is generous treatment by the committee in the consideration of this park.

I feel that it is necessary to say that that is not the fact, and state some of the ancient history in regard to this park. This Rocky Mountain National Park has an area of 254,000 acres in the central part of the United States, as I will show from a very poor map which I have here which I ask Members to look at. It is given this year \$20,000 in order that the park service may make the park one of the most beautiful in the country, one which has been visited by more people than any other national park belonging to the Government. Last year there were in attendance on this park 169,402 people. That number registered in the park. The Mount Rainier National Park is given an appropriation of \$40,000. I do not think that is asking too much or that they receive too much, and yet in view of the fact that their area is only about 200,000 acres and our park far exceeds that amount and the number of people visiting the Rocky Mountain National Park so largely exceeding the number visiting Mount Rainier National Park, we do not think it is too much to ask that we have \$40,000 for this park.

This park was created in 1915, and under the provisions of the act it was provided that no appropriation in excess of \$10,000 should be made for its maintenance without special authorization of Congress. We of the West have to thank very largely for his aid in helping get this bill enacted into law the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] who has in a very forceful way this morning set forth the appreciation he has for national parks as national assets. He believes in their improvement. If this park is to be accessible to the people, and if the people are to receive benefits from it, it is necessary that it be developed in the way of trails and roads. With the \$10,000 limitation it is impossible to very much more than pay the expense of the supervisor and the various rangers. Very little is left with which to make improvements in the park.

After coming here and recognizing this condition, I sought for three terms to get this inhibition removed. I succeeded only last year in having this removed, so that for five years we have had an appropriation of only \$10,000. In view of that I felt completely justified, in view of the estimates presented by the Director of the Forest Service for an appropriation of \$150,000 which he deemed necessary to make this accessible to the people, to come before you at this time and ask for a small increase of \$20,000, or a total appropriation of \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. What has been appropriated for this park heretofore?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Ten thousand dollars a year.

Mr. CANNON. Nothing over that?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Nothing over that.

Mr. CANNON. And the bill carries \$20,000.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman seeks to make that \$40,000?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And we are all for a reduction of expenditures in appropriations.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have been trying to explain that to the gentleman. I sympathize, as he does, with the efforts of the committee to reduce appropriations, but I sometimes think, and in this case I think, it is false economy for the Government to fail to make this park accessible to the people who desire to visit it. As I stated, more people visited this park last year than visited any other park which we have, and yet there are no roads there. We get no income from it. Under the provisions of the bill creating this park, it was the first park that was discriminated against in that respect. It was stated in the bill that no receipts from the park should be used in connection with its maintenance, and that the receipts should be covered into the Treasury of the United States. That was the first park that had that provision in respect to it. It is true that since June, 1917, there has been a provision of legislation that makes that apply to all parks, so that the receipts from all of them are now covered into the Treasury of the United States.

There is no automobile charge for entrance into the Rocky Mountain National Park, as is the case with Mount Rainier. The receipts from Mount Rainier last year were something like \$20,000, while the receipts from the Rocky Mountain National Park were only \$300. The park service can not consistently charge an entrance fee from automobiles where the Government has failed to build any roads that are fit to be used by them. For that reason there have been no receipts, or appreciably none, that are covered into the Treasury of the United States. I do not desire to delay the passage of this bill, and I appeal to you in the interest of what I think is good economy, that the park service be given an opportunity to expend at least this much during the present year in making this park accessible to all of the people.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Will not the gentleman call attention to the fact that this park by its geographical location is far more accessible to the rest of the country, and especially to the Middle West and the Southwest, than a park located on the Pacific coast—at the same time not wishing to indicate that those parks should not have the appropriations that are made for them?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. That is true. It is almost in the center, geographically, of the whole country. I have heard it said that this is a Denver park. I want to disabuse anyone of that idea. This map shows the Rocky Mountain National Park, and it will be seen that Denver is 65 or 70 miles distant from it. Colorado is interested in the development of the park and is aiding to make this park accessible. This year the legislature of that State appropriated \$60,000 for the completion of the Fall River Road, which is a highway running clear through to the west line of the park, and previously had spent much more, and the counties of Boulder and Larimer have, at great expense, built splendid roads leading into the park.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] has presented the need of this additional appropriation so thoroughly that it leaves very little to say. I think the House ought to bear in mind the point he makes as to the accessibility of this park. The Government gets or could get a large amount of fees from the automobile licenses that enter this park. This is the first park in the United States that is encountered when people go west. It is so easily accessible to everyone that nearly everyone goes there. The counties and the State have built fine roads to the park, and consequently many thousands of automobiles do go there and many thousands more would go there and go through the park and over to Grand Lake and other wonderful scenery on the opposite side of the main range of the Rocky Mountains if the Government would aid some in building additional and better roads and trails and more accommodations. Additional money is needed also to protect the park, to guard the scenery, to regulate traffic, and take care of the people who go there, to build more garages to care for the traveling public. It is purely along the public-health and public-spirited line the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has so eloquently expressed that we ought to encourage the outdoor recreation of the American people. The American people ought to see and become acquainted with the marvelous scenery of our own country.

It would make them more contented and better citizens, and as this is one of the very best and grandest, as well as the most accessible, park there is in the United States, Congress ought to spend whatever sum is necessary to make it as nearly as possible accessible to all the traveling public, with suitable care and accommodations for them.

Mr. LAYTON. What about the people who do not travel?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Of course, there are unfortunately many thousands of people who can not visit this or any of the other national parks of the West. I wish everybody in the United States could see those parks. But if they are made as accessible as possible, that will encourage people to go there, and everyone who goes west can and should visit this park.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. If I may suggest to the gentleman, in one day's trip he will see cars—small cars, inexpensive cars, flivvers—from Oklahoma, Nebraska, Iowa, and even from the gentleman's own State, if he goes out there—

Mr. LAYTON. Oh, it would not make any difference if every automobile registered in the State of Delaware were to go to that national park. Under the present circumstances of the Treasury of the United States I do not believe in undertaking increased expenditures where they can be put off for a time. I do not wish to be placed in the category of those who do not appreciate the splendid heritage the country possesses in the national parks, comprising natural scenery unsurpassed anywhere in the world, but at this time I desire to go on record as opposing for the present any appropriation which is not absolutely necessary for the public welfare. When the national finances are stabilized and taxation reduced, when our income exceeds our expenditures, no one will vote more heartily or with greater appreciation for such matters as are now before us than I, but at this hour economy is an imperative necessity, or the consequences will be disastrous to the whole country.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am as much in favor of economy as anyone and I always vote that way. There is a large volume of talk about economy in this House and very little practicing of it. But this appropriation is a matter of business economy. If the park was properly improved, there would be thousands more automobiles going there every year, and the Government might charge a small entrance fee and get all this money back, and I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LAYTON. Will this increase in the expenditures increase the revenues?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. Because it will properly take care of the people and encourage many more of them to go there. The park accommodation is in a very congested condition now. There are thousands and tens of thousands of cars going into that park every year. I do not know what the revenues are, but they could be made very large.

Mr. LAYTON. What are the receipts?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My colleague [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] can tell that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. What is the question?

Mr. LAYTON. What are the latest receipts from this park?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Why, they are only nominal now, only amounting to \$307, because they did not charge for automobile licenses because—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But when they can build proper trails and roads and other developments they can charge a reasonable fee and derive a large revenue from it if that policy is deemed advisable.

Mr. LAYTON. They are going to spend \$40,000 to get \$300? Mr. VAILE. They are going to spend this money to give health to the American people, the same way as in the gentleman's own State, not to get \$300.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Let me say a word about the receipt business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. I move to strike out a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield the gentleman a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes additional remaining.

Mr. GOOD. I am asking for recognition, and I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Rocky Mountain National Park, to begin with, is a different kind of park from that we have been talking about in Oklahoma. This park is five times as big as the District of Columbia. It contains 358 square miles. It was taken over by the National Government about four or five years ago. The park has never had more than \$10,000 a year, not enough money to develop it. You can not charge automobile fees or automobile licenses unless you have roads for them to go over. The Mount Rainier National Park in two years cost the United States Government \$57,100 and took in in automobile fees and other receipts \$39,475. The Mount Rainier National Park only had last year 55,232 people visit it, and the Rocky Mountain National Park had 169,492 people to visit it. I think as a permanent policy we ought not to try to make our park self-sustaining. But during the period of development we are entitled to charge something to the people who come in cars in order that the national parks may be developed more rapidly. The Rocky Mountain National Park is so close to the center of the country that we have thousands of cars from Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Kansas, and near-by States. If you gentlemen from Texas and Oklahoma would campaign in it, you would find many of your voters there and the climate much more comfortable than in your own States. We need this money, and in a few years this Government will get the money back. We had 33,000 automobiles in the Rocky Mountain Park last year. By charging \$2 apiece, which could be done if anything had been done by the United States Government to help develop this park, we would have had \$66,000 from that source, so by spending a little money we might make a revenue producer of that magnificent park. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a great national park, comprising, as the gentleman says, something like 254,000 acres, and a great many people visit the park, and the reason why the park does not have more revenue than \$307 a year is because we have not developed the roads and trails in the park. This appropriation is just twice the appropriation for the current year and it will enable them to start a little on their work. The committee was not unmindful of the fact that in the near future considerable development work will be necessary in this park. We will be compelled to build some roads through this park, which is a wonderful park, but under present conditions the committee felt that it would be compelled to treat this park just as it treated the other national parks and practically confine the work to maintenance, and therefore it has carried in this bill \$20,000, which is just twice the appropriation of former years, and I sincerely hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. TIMBERLAKE) there were—ayes 14, yeas 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not exceeding \$1,800 for purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$275,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking why the form of all these appropriations is changed this year. Is it on account of some technical ruling?

Mr. GOOD. No; but to make them uniform. Heretofore there has been a difference in the phraseology, and it seemed to the committee that inasmuch as these appropriations are for similar objects, the only difference being expenditures in different parks, that the language carrying the appropriation should be uniform.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not think that the law heretofore has carried the words "administration" or "maintenance." It may in some one case—

Mr. GOOD. It has always been provided for and paid out of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand that. I am not criticizing the form, but I wondered whether there had been some technical ruling on the subject as to why the committee added those two words.

Mr. GOOD. I had not in mind the two words referred to; but they were not carried in this item, but in the Yellowstone appropriation; for instance, it is carried for administration and maintenance, and the committee felt, inasmuch as—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They were in one case, I think, maybe one other; but as a rule the language read before "for protection and improvement." Now it reads, "for administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement," and I just ask if this was caused by a ruling with reference to it or a desire to add language to the appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; the committee is not advised as to any ruling that would interfere because the money was used for administration and maintenance, and inasmuch as it was carried in the same items in this language the committee felt that as it was available for this purpose the language should be uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Zion National Park, Utah: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$2,500.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WELLING: Page 113, line 19, after the words "improvement," strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$7,300."

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, the estimates furnished to the committee for the maintenance of this park for the next fiscal year amounted to \$10,000, as follows: Salaries for chief ranger, rangers, clerk, \$5,100; maintenance and repairs, \$2,200; and construction of highways, \$2,700. I believe the chairman of the committee, upon reflection, will feel that since this park has been established the appropriation for it ought to be increased above that which has been allowed in the past as a national monument. This park comprises an area of a little more than 70,000 acres, or about 113 square miles. From an archaeological point of view it is one of the most interesting pieces of public land in America to-day. Along the perpendicular walls of this canyon gorge are the prehistoric dwelling places of the cliff dwellers of America. The scientists of the Smithsonian Institution and of almost every western university go into this region every year for the purpose of excavating in these important prehistoric ruins. Geologically, it is one of the most important scenic wonders of America. No increase has been given to this park over the amount heretofore granted to the national monument, and it seems to me that since it has been established as a national park some additional funds ought to be provided for its proper maintenance. I am not asking a cent, in accord with the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of this committee that the House at this time should not spend additional money on improvements in the national parks, but surely there ought to be given sufficient money for the police protection of the park and for the proper protection of these ancient ruins that have been found there. I sincerely hope the committee will adopt the amendment increasing the amount about \$5,000.

This park is peculiarly a national institution. It does not belong to Salt Lake City, nor is it adjacent, as are many of our parks, to any great city. It lies on the main highway of what will soon be a direct route from the thickly settled area of the intermountain country to the northern rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The State of Utah, recognizing the need and value of this great national recreation and educational center, has appropriated more than \$200,000 to build a great highway to the gateway of the park, and the small amount asked for in this appropriation will barely police and care for the property of the Government.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, as we are just concluding the part of the bill relating to the national parks, it is an oppor-

tune time to call attention to the annual conclave of the Imperial Council of the Shriners, which is to be held in Portland, Oreg., on June 22, 23, and 24 of this year. It is opportune to do this because it is expected that many of the Shriners, in going to the council and returning, will visit our national parks. It is hoped that many of the Shriners will visit the wonderful Crater Lake Park in Oregon.

For several months I have had up the matter with the National Park Service of clearing the roads of snow leading to Crater Lake National Park in my district, so that the Shriners may view this wonderful phenomenon of nature. I have had assurance from Director Mather that the park service will do all in its power to clear the road of snow by the time the Shriners visit Portland, Oreg. I think the park service will be justified in going to every expense to afford the Nobles of this great order a view of this wonderful scene. They will return "boosters" of the National Park Service.

#### CRATER LAKE.

Crater Lake is situated in Klamath County, Oreg., in the southwestern corner of my district. It is a lake, cauldronlike and circular, 7,000 feet high, perched amid the peaks. Perpendicular sides of slaggy lava rise over a thousand feet from waters of indigo blue 6 miles across and 2,000 feet deep.

To the scientist, a mighty volcano collapsed within itself, Mount Mazama, 15,000 feet high, telescoped.

To the poet, "the sea of sapphire," "the sea of silence," "a lake of mystery."

To me, a shell hole of a war of worlds—who knows?

Could the great blind poet have seen this marvel ere his pen had Lucifer and his host of rebel angels—

Hurled headlong flaming from the ethereal sky.  
With hideous ruin and combustion down—

in Miltonic imagery here he'd have found the impact. [Loud applause.]

The Shriners will go to Crater Lake through Medford, in my colleague's [Mr. HAWLEY] district, or through Klamath Falls, in my district.

#### BEND.

After making the pilgrimage to Crater Lake the Shriners should go to Bend, in central Oregon, in my district. From Bend they will see the great amphitheater of hills which rise and radiate from the Columbia to the cardinal points. They will see how hill piles on hill. How the hills rise in the purple haze of twilight like billows suddenly stilled on the crest. They will see the rim of the amphitheater and horizon from central Oregon, pillared with a dozen lofty, eternal snow-capped peaks, once blazing beacons, now only reflecting above the dusk of the valleys from lofty eminences of snow and ice, the soft pink glow of setting sun, as the day drops into the westward waters of the Pacific. [Applause.]

These snow-capped peaks are our reservoirs, eternal, exhaustless in life-giving waters, in energy, and power.

#### COLUMBIA'S GORGE.

After seeing the mountains in their majesty from Bend the pilgrimage should continue to The Dalles through the Deschutes Canyon, so narrow that it might have been cut with a "saber stroke" of Mars. The Dalles, at the end of the old Oregon trail, is my home and birthplace. Here the Shriners will see where the great inland sea, which once covered eastern Oregon, Washington, and parts of Idaho, according to the geologists, broke through the barrier of the Cascades Range in some titanic convulsion of nature.

The Indian legend is that Mount Hood and Mount Adams, once espoused, engaged in a mighty marital combat, whose struggles broke the mountain barrier, and the inland sea disappeared through the gorge of the Columbia.

The Indian's awe even now bears witness to the tribe's tradition. From his canoe, as he glides through the Columbia's gorge, he sees the two mythical mates of a Miocene age, Hood and Adams, now hiding behind the towering hills, ever and anon, through favorable gaps in the gorge, stealing furtive peeps each at the other.

It may be so. Perhaps the Indian, "who sees God in the wind," witnessed some colossal cataclysm of nature. The surroundings bear evidence of the epochal. A broad river suddenly turns on edge at train speed, rushes through a gash in the lava flow. Palisades, a sheer thousand feet, dwarfing the Hudson's, rise from the water's edge. Giant causeways abound, dwarfing Erin's.

These are but few of the marvels of the mountains which we shall show unto the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. We expect few of the Shriners will ever leave our State. We shall hold them as willing, voluntary captives to the charms of where rolls the Oregon when they view these scenes, when they witness the



billowy wheat fields of eastern Oregon and partake of the delicious Dalles cherry, the luscious Hood River strawberry, and the incomparable Hood River apple.

We know the visiting Nobles will exclaim with the poet, Joaquin Miller, who said the scenes a part of which I have feebly portrayed brought his love of song to the surface:

See once these stately scenes, then roam no more;  
No more remains on earth to cultured eyes;  
The cataract comes down, a broken roar,  
The palisades defy approach, and rise  
Green moss'd and dripping to the clouded skies.  
The canyon thunders with its full of foam,  
And calls loud-mouth'd, and all the land defies;  
The mounts make fellowship and dwell at home  
In snowy brotherhood beneath their purpled dome.

All this, and even more than tongue can tell, awaits the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine on their pilgrimage to the hills of Oregon, "rock ribbed and ancient as the sun." [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, after the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Oregon on this wonderful park, it seems almost like dropping from the sublime to the ridiculous to commence to speak about Zion National Park, and yet the amendment before the House has to do with that park. Now, Zion National Park was a national monument until an act of Congress approved last November—

Mr. MADDEN. Zion is a little bit higher than the highest snow peak the gentleman was talking about, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. This is another Zion. This is Zion National Park out in Utah that I am discussing. For the current year there was an appropriation of \$10,000 for national monuments. There are 10 of them. But by the act of Congress approved November 29, 1919, Zion was made a national park. Therefore the appropriations for national monuments would not be available longer for this park, and it was necessary to make an appropriation for the maintenance of this park. In 1919 they actually expended on this national monument \$1,400. Now, it seemed to me that we were very liberal when we increased that appropriation to \$2,500.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Of course, in other national parks we have expended as much as \$275,000.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WELLING. And for this national park we are not asking a cent for roads, or improvements of that sort, but there were 10,000 or 12,000 people who visited the park area last year. It is away from any city two or three hundred miles. It needs police protection, and it is important, it seems to me, in view of the increased number of visitors that will be there next year, to provide this police protection.

Mr. GOOD. There are very few visitors to that park.

Mr. WELLING. I know there were not very many visitors to the park last year, but there will be a great many this year.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call attention to this fact: There is the Rocky Mountain National Park. When we first commenced to make appropriations for it in 1915, the first appropriation for that park of 254,000 acres was only \$3,000, and I think we are commencing very liberally in the appropriations for this park, especially at this time, when everything that is done in the way of improvements costs so much money. It was only intended to give it police protection and to postpone until the future and to a more normal condition the appropriation for improvements.

Mr. WELLING. The amount asked is \$10,000, to \$2,200 of which was to be for road improvement. I sympathize with the purpose of the gentleman, and I have purposely avoided asking for any money at all for improvements but just enough to give the necessary police protection.

Mr. GOOD. The department asked for \$150,000 for the Rocky Mountain Park, but we gave them only \$20,000, and with reference to this item under the circumstances I think the committee has done all that could be expected at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Is this park a recent creation, or has it stood there for all the ages?

Mr. GOOD. It was accepted as a national park by the act approved last November.

Mr. CANNON. But the scenery was there all the time, was it not?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Dating from Adam?

Mr. GOOD. I think so. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, these centers of recreation in the mountain regions are very interesting and it is a very nice thing for people to go to them and drink in the rare atmosphere that they boast of.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is there anything else that we have to drink?

Mr. MADDEN. That is about all. [Laughter.] But I want to call attention to the fact that while these men from those regions are asking increased appropriations that are not necessary at all, in every other section of the country where we have the business of the country to conduct we are endeavoring to assist in reducing appropriations in order that we may be able to keep the expenses of the Government within the revenues.

Take the Postal Service, for example. All the great cities of the United States have inadequate postal facilities, and the people in every one of these cities are clamoring for appropriations for added facilities, and they are justified in clamoring for such appropriations.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman has just said that the people in the neighborhood where business is conducted and where there are business activities are clamoring for increased appropriations for the postal men. Am I right?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. I said for postal facilities—buildings and such things. We are asking also for increased salaries for the men, but we will cut that out of the present discussion.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why cut it out?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield just now. I just wanted to illustrate—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman answer one inquiry?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will answer an inquiry.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Then why does the gentleman—

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to make a statement, but I will let the gentleman ask the question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why does the gentleman object?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to go on and make the statement that I was going to make.

These people who have been willing to make the sacrifice are getting along without the necessary facilities in order to help the country out of the national embarrassment which the country finds itself in; and yet these men coming from the mountain districts are demanding more money for playgrounds. We are compelled in the great city of Chicago and in all the other great cities of the United States to distribute the mail on the sidewalks because we have not the necessary building facilities to enable us to do the work as it ought to be done, and yet these sections of the country that pay no part of the great expenses of the Government send Representatives here who insist upon increased appropriations for things that are not necessary.

Now, I think that the men who are asking for these appropriations ought to begin to realize that they are a part of the United States and that if a panic comes as the result of the extravagant waste of public money, their people will realize it just as quickly as anybody else and they will suffer with the rest of us. Now, if we are willing to forego expenditures in our sections of the country, where we pay the bills—and these expenses are justified for legitimate Government reasons—these men ought to be willing to forego the right to demand appropriations for reasons that are not justified; and for one I propose to stand here in opposition, now and in the future, to all such appropriations as are demanded by these men from the Rocky Mountain districts for park purposes while the business of the country is embarrassed because of the inability of the Government to supply the needs, because it is believed that the people are already overburdened with taxation.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds passed a resolution not long since to the effect that no public-building bill should be considered in this Congress, because they believed that the Government can not afford to make the appropriation. Now, everybody will agree that in all the great business centers of the country we need buildings in which to transact the public business, and the people there can not understand why they do not get them. When they are told about it they are glad to conform to the conditions in order to help out the situation. We want these men in these sparsely settled regions where there is nothing but ice and snow, as the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. SINNOTT] has just told you, with which to regale the men who are about to visit that section of the country, to be sufficiently patriotic to join us in an effort to economize in order that the people of the country may be released from the burdens that are placed upon their backs by this excessive taxation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLACK. I have listened with a great deal of interest and entire approval to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] for economy in Government expenditures. In the splendid argument that he made he referred to the condition of the Postal Service and to the need for increased facilities. While the gentleman was making his eloquent remarks I was forcibly reminded that there is now before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads what is known as the Fess bill, which has for its object the repealing of the third and fourth year rates of the zone postal law and the relieving of publishers whose publications are now being carried through the mails at much less than the actual cost of carrying them. Even at the maximum of rates provided in the present law the Government will be a heavy loser in the transportation of second-class mail matter.

The commission, headed by the distinguished jurist, Associate Justice Hughes, which a few years ago made a very exhaustive investigation of the cost of carrying second-class mail matter, reported to the Congress that it cost  $5\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound to transport and distribute this class of mail matter, not including certain charges which were not allocated. It is admitted that the weight of second-class mail matter is more than a billion pounds a year, and that makes an annual cost to the Postal Service, conservatively estimated, of \$55,000,000, exclusive of certain overhead expenses. The rates at present in force produced only about \$15,000,000 the first year, will produce about \$22,000,000 the second year, \$27,000,000 the third year, and \$32,000,000 the fourth year, when they reach the peak of cost and remain permanent at that figure. That will leave us a loss on the carriage and distributing cost of carrying every pound of second-class matter. It will be a very substantial loss at that. Yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the distinguished economist of the Republican side of the House, is leading the fight to report out a bill that would stop these rates at the second year and relieve publishers like the Curtis Publishing Co., whose publications are being carried through the mails at an estimated loss of at least \$4,000,000 a year to the Government. Mr. John C. Koons, in his testimony before the House Post Office Committee, stated some time ago that every issue of the Saturday Evening Post, even under the present rates, caused a loss to the Government of the United States of \$150,000. I have no fight to make on the Saturday Evening Post, but I am not in favor of the Government carrying it at such a heavy loss.

I agree that the postal employees ought to have better salaries and better wages, and I am wondering if the steering committee on the Republican side of the House are going to bring out a bill that will relieve the millionaire publishers instead of relieving the postal employees. If that is what you gentlemen are preparing to do, then we on this side of the House are ready to meet the issue. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. WELLING].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment as a new paragraph, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKeown: Page 113, line 19, after the figures "\$2,500," insert a new paragraph, as follows: "That no sum appropriated herein for national parks shall be available for use of any park wherein any hotel or transportation company is permitted to charge unreasonable rates for accommodations."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee to debate this amendment. It has come to my attention that in some of these parks the rates are so prohibitive that nobody except the ultra rich can stop there. These parks are for the accommodation of the entire public of the United States, and men of moderate means ought to be permitted to have some of the accommodations that go along with the beauties of the national parks.

Mr. CANNON. Are the rates fixed by the present law?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand they are fixed by regulation.

Mr. CANNON. Then before they could use any of this money we would have to get somebody to determine what are reasonable rates, and before that could be done I suppose the season would pass by.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman would not be in favor of permitting some hotel company or transportation company to charge unreasonable rates?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all; but we have no machinery to ascertain what is provided in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the duty of fixing the rate, and he ought not to permit them to charge unreasonable rates. If they are doing it, it ought to be called to his attention.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] that I have a good deal of confidence in the Secretary of the Interior. It is not only his right to fix these rates, but the law requires that he shall fix reasonable rates. I think we have a very able Secretary of the Interior, and I think we have one of the best and ablest park commissioners we have ever had.

Mr. McKEOWN. I agree to that part of it.

Mr. GOOD. And I am willing that they shall administer the law as it is upon the statute books. That law simply provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe reasonable rates. It has not been brought to the attention of the committee that any rates were unreasonable. There has been complaint that in order to bring about good accommodations, where we once had poor accommodations, where we had a whole lot of so-called competition and no service, a schedule of rates was fixed and a concession was given to one person, giving him the right to do certain things in the park and to perform certain services there. The service has been very greatly improved, but the cost of the service has not increased at all in comparison with the increased cost of labor.

Mr. McKEOWN. There has been considerable complaint about some of the charges in some of the western parks. Some people say they are absolutely prohibitive, and this amendment will regulate that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter members of the Board of United States General Appraisers may be allowed not to exceed \$7 per diem for expenses of subsistence actually incurred while traveling or engaged on official business at places other than the city of New York.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I notice that it provides \$7 per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence. My recollection is that the law provides \$5.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just a moment while I make a statement?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This provision applies to the Board of General Appraisers, of whom there are nine. The gentleman will recollect that a former and esteemed colleague of ours is a member of that board. This board of appraisers and the attorneys who appear before them are required to make trips over the country for the purpose of hearing contested customs cases. Their duties take them to the larger cities. They do not visit any city except the larger cities.

The statement is made, and I am sure borne out by the facts, that it is absolutely impossible for them to get even a room in a hotel in the large cities for less than the amount of the per diem now allowed. Seven dollars would not pay the entire expense. As a matter of fact, the Board of General Appraisers think they ought to have the same per diem allowance as the Federal judges who hold court in the large cities. But the committee decided to increase it \$2, which, as I say, is not sufficient to pay all the expenses.

Mr. BLACK. I will state that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have had substantially the same complaint about the per diem allowance for post-office inspectors who do most of their work in the large cities. Probably we might have the same complaint all along the line. It seems to me that the equitable thing to do, if we are to increase the per diem allowance, is to take up the whole subject and provide for it by proper legislation.

I do not know any better paid officials in the Government service than this Board of General Appraisers. I know of some Government servants that are not nearly so well paid who are meeting worse difficulties than these officials.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman realizes that as a matter of fact the per diem which is provided for this board presents a different proposition from the per diem allowed for those who visit the smaller towns, where hotel expenses are not so great.

Mr. BLACK. I had that in mind. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman's point of order goes to the whole paragraph?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks, referees, and trustees of the United States courts and the Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice or the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, including not to exceed \$200,000 for necessary employees at the seat of government, and including a director of the Bureau of Investigation at not exceeding \$7,500 per annum, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That for the purpose of executing the duties for which provision is made by this appropriation, the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be designated "special agents of the Department of Justice," and who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances to be made by the disbursing clerk of the Department of Justice when authorized and approved by the Attorney General, the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso beginning on line 18, page 119.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of a point of order is made, but the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry relative to this service. As I understand, there is another department of the Government which has for its purpose the same work as this Bureau of Investigation. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee why it is that all of these departments can not be put under one division? Is it not true that a goodly part of these investigations are duplications?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not think so. I suppose the gentleman refers to the department under the Treasury. Now, the department under the Treasury has to do with the question of counterfeiting, and that alone, practically. I think the only other function that that department performs is to furnish police protection for the President. This department is altogether different. It is true they carry on a detective service, but in this case they investigate practically all crimes committed against the United States except that of counterfeiting, and that is left to the Department of the Treasury, which confines its activities to that alone.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that the Treasury Department does go outside of counterfeiting, and is it not true that before a prosecution is made it must be put up to an investigation by the Attorney General's office? Does it not finally come back to the Department of Justice to determine whether or not a crime has been committed?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think there is very little duplication. It is true that in the Customs Service there is some work carried on by the Treasury Department to prevent fraud against the Government. This is quite a different thing. This has to do with practically all of the criminal statutes of the United States.

Mr. DOWELL. They also have charge of investigating the same character of work that is carried on in the Treasury Department. For instance, if a crime is committed in counterfeiting, an investigation is or may be carried on by the Department of Justice in order to ascertain whether or not the crime has actually been committed.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think that is carried on by the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOWELL. My inquiry of the gentleman is whether or not it is not possible to put all this under one head so that the investigations may be made from one source instead of from different sources.

Mr. GOOD. I think that would be all right if there was any duplication, but if there is any duplication at all it is a very minor duplication. As I understand, the persons employed by Mr. Moran, of the Treasury Department, are only to make investigations along the line of counterfeiting and fraud on the

Customs Service. These persons employed by the Attorney General's department do not give their attention to those particular crimes, and the Attorney General only takes up the work when his office is called upon to prosecute, and then I think he accepts the findings and work of the Secret Service men.

Mr. DOWELL. In view of the fact that the Department of Justice must finally handle the case, would it not be better that all investigations should be made by the Department of Justice?

Mr. GOOD. In many cases investigations do not go to the extent of prosecution. They go to the extent sometimes of preventing crimes. If a person has been apprehended, then the work is taken over by the Attorney General, and the evidence is turned over to him, and I doubt very much if there is any lost motion in this.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In the proviso the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be designated "special agents of the Department of Justice." How are these officials now designated?

Mr. GOOD. These officials are known as operators, and without a special designation. As I recall, the statement was made that they did not have the authority to carry firearms. A person who is designated as a special agent of the Department of Justice as provided in the paragraph under the law would be authorized to carry firearms. The Attorney General feels that these persons should be protected; that they should go out with some protection in the way of firearms. That was the reason for including this provision.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This provision says "and who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties." I do not know just what "such duties" may be, but by general terms to give employees of the Government authority to do anything they please is making it pretty broad.

Mr. GOOD. The Attorney General has this to say:

Mr. PALMER. Under the statutes as they now exist, my understanding is that the special agents have no status whatsoever. It is a title that has been given under the administration of the department, and as an instance of that, an agent has no authority to carry a firearm. It is only by the courtesy of the States that they are allowed to carry any firearms. If a State official, a sheriff or any other State official, wants to prosecute one of the agents of our department, he can do so for carrying a concealed weapon. It is only in the District here that they are allowed to carry one, and this clause was inserted with that in view—to give them an official status and the same rank as a Secret Service operator under the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The fact is that the country is burdened with special agents of various departments, and when a man goes into a place seeking to exercise some authority which, perhaps, he ought not to exercise, and presents a card as special agent of the Department of Justice, and says that Congress has given him all of the authority he needs for the execution of any duty that he chooses to attempt to perform, it resolves itself into nothing more than a method of intimidation.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, it has been suggested that some of these secret agents in New York City have been putting prisoners through the third degree even more cruel than anything heretofore experienced in the city of New York. I wonder if "such duties" would include the third degree.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This would give them all of the authority they thought was necessary for the execution of any duties that the Department of Justice chose to give them to perform, apparently without any limitation. It is the broadest language that I recall in any statutory provision of law. I am personally rather tired of the complaints, whether they be justified or not, of so many people about the constant visits they have from various special agents of the different departments of the Government.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have given the gentleman all of the light that I have on the subject, and when the Attorney General asked for this, in view of the very critical situation throughout the country at the present time, the committee did not feel warranted in declining to give that authority.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. While, perhaps, the Attorney General may be justified in all that he asks, I am not in favor of letting agents of the Department of Justice arrest anyone they please on any kind of a suspicion that they may have, and say that Congress has given them authority to do it. They probably would not arrest the gentleman from Iowa and probably not myself, although it is not unlikely that they might summon either one of us and put us under examination. I think it would be well to have this matter considered in the Senate. If the Senate choose to insert it, then it can be considered in conference, where probably it will get more investigation than it would if the item went into the bill to the Senate. I make the

point of order against the proviso, beginning on line 18 and ending with line 23, page 119.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against the proviso in line 18 and ending with line 23, on page 119. The Chair thinks the proviso is legislation and sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "further," after the word "Provided," in line 23, page 119.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 23, page 119, strike out the word "further."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill, on line 17, page 119, by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 119, line 17, strike out the figures "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if it be adopted, will carry for the next year the appropriation now made for the Department of Justice for the purpose set forth in this paragraph, lacking \$100,000. In other words, the appropriation for the current year carries for the detection and prosecution of crime the sum of \$2,600,000. When the estimates were submitted the Department of Justice asked for \$3,500,000 for that purpose. When the Attorney General appeared before the committee he stated that he realized the necessity for economy and that he was anxious himself to see economy practiced. Therefore, he voluntarily withdrew from his estimates \$1,000,000, and stated that if the Congress would give him \$2,500,000 for the next year he hoped to be able to get along. He now has a force or organization based on an expenditure at the rate of \$2,600,000 per year. If you adopt the provision carried in the bill, then you will reduce the organization on July 1 by the sum of \$500,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. What is the force of the Department of Justice now, in number?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I could not tell the gentleman that without referring to the hearings. I will look it up and let the gentleman know later. As has been stated, this sum is for the detection and prosecution of all crimes under the United States statutes. The Attorney General says that at least 40 per cent of the sum will be used in the campaign against the alien radicals and the anarchists in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is to be gained by employing a large number of special agents to make arrests on information and belief against aliens suspected of violating the anarchistic clauses of the immigration laws when we are unable to deport them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Department of Justice, as the gentleman knows, has nothing to do with the decision of those cases, and I submit that merely because another department has failed, if that be the case, to take action on the cases that are put up to it, is no reason why we should deny to the Department of Justice the amount necessary to run down these radicals and anarchists and put them up to the proper party for decision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Permit me to put a proposition to the gentleman: We want the laws sustained, and while I have no desire to criticize one department more than another—or, in fact, any department—yet if we must do it we may as well make the criticism. The overloading of the jails is never good. Now, the organizer of these Department of Justice raids, if he had thought about it a minute, would have known that the number of arrests would be beyond the capacity of another department of the Government to quickly take up and investigate the arrests.

If we have too many special agents employed for the purpose of probing and finding out, they will keep on making those arrests, and aliens will be put into jail much faster than the Immigration Service can take care of them. The increase of appropriation is proposed in the wrong place. Let the sum be

appropriated for additional immigration inspectors, who can prepare cases and evidence against revolutionary aliens.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, if the Department of Justice through its special agents is engaged in arresting those who are guilty of an infraction of our laws or inciting rebellion or undertaking to injure the Government or seeking to destroy it by force and violence, merely because some other department is not able to proceed as rapidly as it ought possibly to do—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Or as rapidly as arrests are made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Or as rapidly as the guilty parties are detected and arrested, that is no reason why we should deny the Department of Justice the full complement of investigators necessary to make those investigations. You would not stop the running down and arresting of thieves or murderers merely because the courts could not dispose of the cases as rapidly as they were brought before them. Why make a distinction in the case of any violators of the law? Now, what are you doing by reducing this appropriation? You are serving notice upon the alien radicals and anarchists of this country who would use force and violence that we are reducing the organization of the Department of Justice, which was formed for the purpose of running them down and bringing them to book and sending them back to where they belong in the event they are found guilty. I do not think this Congress can afford at this particular time to take the position of cutting the organization of the Department of Justice 20 per cent during the next fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But notice to that effect has been served both through acts of the Department of Labor and through certain—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I remember to have noticed a statement in the Washington papers quoting the gentleman himself, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration, in a hearing before the Committee on Rules, as very highly commending the Department of Justice for all that had been done, and stating—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask that the gentleman from Tennessee have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, if he commends what it has done up to this time, it seems to me that he must agree that when we undertake to cut down the appropriations beginning July 1 and reduce that organization we are doing something that we ought not to do, for we are depriving the Attorney General of the machinery necessary to carry out the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, what I said the other day before the Rules Committee was that in my opinion the Department of Justice had performed a great service in the United States in breaking up a conspiracy. Now, we have had some rulings since the arrests were made. We find, through the rulings of the Secretary of Labor, that the alien members of the Communist Party are deportable for membership; that alien members of the Communist Labor Party are not deportable except for individual overt acts; and alien members of the Russian Workers' Union are deportable for membership; and that alien members of the I. W. W. are not deportable except for overt acts. Now, you will not have to have a great number of special agents trying to classify revolutionary aliens and others, because they will all know enough to get out of the Communist Party into these other parties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman stands for an amendment of the laws so as to make them more stringent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Attorney General stated that the work of the department was becoming more difficult day by day for this reason; these alien radicals and anarchists, who are of course subject to deportation, are now standing in the background—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Dodging and denying.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And dodging, as the gentleman says, and permitting citizens who have like radical tendencies and ideas to take the lead in these matters. Now, of course, it is as much the duty of the Attorney General to ferret out crime on the part of citizens as of aliens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Although he complains—and I think complains very properly—that he has not sufficient authority under the law to enable him to effectively punish citizens guilty of such offenses. He has asked Congress for such legislation, but it has failed to give it to him. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to another fact. The appropria-



tion as carried under this paragraph is not confined alone to this particular crime. I stated awhile ago that probably 40 per cent of it is used for the purpose to which the gentleman has alluded. In addition to that, it is made the duty of the Attorney General to prosecute all crimes upon the calendar and these special agents are engaged in detecting crime of all kinds.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VARE. Will my colleague state to the committee how much of this fund was used for the investigation of the election offenses in Michigan?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My recollection is that the sum of \$40,000 was so expended, but there were fines amounting to \$45,000 assessed in that case.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will permit, I think at the time of the hearings the trial of that case had not concluded.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My statement is based on information given me since that time.

Mr. MacCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MacCRATE. Can the gentleman inform the committee how many men were arrested as the result of May day activities?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman means—

Mr. MacCRATE. Those of May 1.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not; no.

Mr. MacCRATE. Has the gentleman any idea how many persons were taken?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether any were arrested or not.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does this amount allowed here include what is necessary to investigate the profiteering in the necessities of life?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. What per cent will be allowed for that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Attorney General stated that if allowed \$2,000,000, a million of it would be expended in the detection and prosecution of the alien radicals and anarchists; that \$1,100,000 of it would be expended for the detection and prosecution of all other crimes against the United States; and that \$500,000 of it would be used in the campaign against the high cost of living and the prosecution of profiteers.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think in view of the charges made against the Attorney General that he is not trying to reduce the high cost of living, he ought to have sufficient funds?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I certainly do, and if this money is not appropriated for him and he is not given the money he asks from Congress, and especially since he asks no more for next year than he has had this year, then I think those who vote against it are estopped from making any criticism against the Department of Justice for not reducing the high cost of living or from offering any complaint if all these laws are not fully enforced. The Attorney General has fearlessly done his duty. He has done it in the face of criticism from those who are guilty of violating our laws, and Congress can do no less, it seems to me, than supply him with the necessary funds to carry on this work and thereby serve notice not only on the radicals and anarchists but also upon the profiteers and other law violators that Congress intends to stand behind him and back him up to the limit in his effort to enforce the law. [Applause.]

Mr. MacCRATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This bill carries an appropriation for books for the Department of Justice. It seems to me among those books there should be the Constitution of the United States, the Federalist, and a copy of the Revised Statutes of the United States, for I do not believe that outside of the Department of Justice there is such ignorance of the limitation of the powers of that department as there exists in the department.

No radical leader in this generation has done more to unsettle the nerves of the American people than has the Attorney General. He has awakened class antagonism to greater pitch than any preacher of class warfare. He borrows the bitterest terms of denunciation and hurls them indiscriminately here and there and elsewhere at portions of our people. Whenever the country seems ready to settle down and the national nerves are about normal, he breaks out, crying, "The Republic is endangered." Other men cry out for the repeal of war-time legislation. His voice utters a demand that we must not let war-time legislation die with the coming of peace. He failed to prosecute a

single profiteer from January to June, 1919, under war-time legislation, yet in savage language sought to arouse the American people against Congress to turn their indignation from himself.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacCRATE. Not just yet.

In 1919, at Albany, N. Y., he proclaimed himself the David ready to slay the Goliath who threatened the American table. He declared that the "wrath of the American people will compel a verdict of conviction" of the packers. Yet in 1920 he cloisters himself with counsel for the packers and permits them to withdraw unharmed from the criminal courts. No man wants innocent men, of large or small means, unjustly convicted, but what did the Attorney General mean to do when he trumpeted to the country his opinion that their wrath would demand conviction of the packers? If the packers committed no crime, why seek to stir the wrath of our people against them? If they did commit crime, why permit them to go free while others must be imprisoned?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking in order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MacCRATE. I submit that this is in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has prepared a set speech on this subject, and he ought to get it out of his system. It hurts.

Mr. MacCRATE. The gentleman from Texas does not think what he is going to say, but the gentleman from New York does think.

Mr. BLANTON. What the gentleman from Texas does think and say is in order and to the point.

Mr. MacCRATE. Surely it is a strange sight to witness an Attorney General crying for convictions on wrath and not on evidence.

Have constitutional guaranties become so obsolete that impartial justice is an impossibility for our citizens? Is suspicion to supplant facts in the conduct of the affairs of government?

We will never get back to normal while the chief law officer of the country proceeds in violation of constitutional and statutory principles and everlastingly arouses the people to suspect each other. There are, as there always have been, bad men among us. If the Attorney General will get them and rightly put them in jail, we will be able to count them with certainty, but we will never know their number as long as their only place of confinement is the mind of the Attorney General.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacCRATE. Shortly.

The American people are tired of talk about the existence of hundreds of thousands of dangerous profiteers and overthrowers of Government while a baker's dozen only find their way to a place of punishment.

Our Attorney General has become a general adviser to the housewives of America. Daily for months he has told the good women of America what to cook, when to cook, what to wear, and when to wear, what to buy and when to buy.

He tells our wives and mothers how to make chuck taste like sirloin and how to be satisfied with old-fashioned gingham instead of new silks. He warns them to beware of demanding too many styles of clothing in one season. For the top of the head and the sole of the foot, for outer garments and inner needs, our indefatigable Attorney General has a daily suggestion. Surely we who have seen Sunday's noonday meal come on the table in a new dress on Monday, Tuesday, and sometimes on Wednesday know that our women folks need no assistance from a Federal officeholder on the art of making Sunday's delicious roast beef Wednesday's delightful hash. We who have watched feathers and flowers transposed and transplanted to make the old hat look like new, and who have seen a dress of three seasons made modern and fit for the fourth, recommend to the Attorney General that he take from rather than give advice to the American housewife.

Where in the Revised Statutes does our learned Attorney General read that he should advise as to the food, the drink, and the clothing of the American people? By what authority does he join with the packers in recommending "cheap cuts" to the American public? The Revised Statutes lay down the duties and powers of the Department of Justice. They provide for "men learned in the law" to advise the President, the various executive departments, and to prosecute actions in the courts of the country.

If we are going to convert the Department of Justice into a department of household economy, let us put at the head of the department one of the millions of American mothers who has

been transforming dad's trousers into son's pants while the Attorney General has been trying mightily to make presidential garments out of the official clothes he now wears.

Now, I am ready to yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wondered—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that the gentleman may be given one more minute, in order that he may answer a pointed question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wonder if the gentleman from New York can tell the House just how many arrests and how many convictions have been made by the Department of Justice under the food-control act?

Mr. MACCRATE. I have been endeavoring to get that. I introduced a resolution in this House myself asking specifically as between January 1 and June 30, 1919, and the Attorney General himself responded that there was not a solitary conviction in the whole United States.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not asking the gentleman for any specific period of time.

Mr. MACCRATE. That is the only period for which I have asked.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has delivered a set speech, in which he has vigorously denounced the Attorney General and accused the Attorney General of not complying with his obligation as an officer of the United States. Now, I want to know whether or not the gentleman has information as to just what the Attorney General has done under the act of which he complains?

Mr. MACCRATE. All I know is that the Attorney General has promised to put every profiteer in jail, and there have been only about two dozen put in jail.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How many arrests under the food-control act, and do you know how many convictions?

Mr. MACCRATE. Assuming that the number of arrests is great, then the Attorney General is more blameworthy if there are so few in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know that within the last 90 days the Attorney General has apprehended about 6,000 anarchists and that just the other day Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, testified before the Committee on Rules that he used to be a loyal Republican, yet the country knows he has turned most of these 6,000 anarchists loose on the people of America? Louis F. Post, and not the Attorney General of the United States, is wholly responsible for the law not being applied to the infamous anarchists now menacing the United States.

How is he going to reconcile that state of affairs with his speech?

Mr. MACCRATE. Well, if those 6,000 exist in the same place that the bomb throwers of May 1 existed, there are not any. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if it had not been for the action taken by the Attorney General there would probably have been some of them throwing bombs in this House from the gallery yonder.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request? There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes—5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and 5 minutes by myself.

Mr. McKEOWN. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then I make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, to be divided as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to know how much of this 20 minutes is to be divided among those defending the good name of one of the Cabinet officers of the land, which has just been brought into disrepute.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the debate will be confined to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Then none of it will be used to offset some of the attacks that have been made upon him on the floor.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. You could not divide up time in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] two questions in connection with the appropriation for the office of the Attorney General. Some time ago, as has been mentioned here in the debates, there were a large number of arrests of aliens, belonging to the Communist Party. It is contended by the Department of Labor that many of these men were merely nominal members of the party and did not know the obligations that they had subscribed to.

It also appears that the Attorney General's office—the Department of Justice—did not arrest and did not apprehend men who were the leaders in this Communist Party movement, but that the arrests were made merely of the rank and file, many of whom, it is claimed, were entirely ignorant of the details of the principles of the Communist Party. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to that, and the reason for not arresting and apprehending the leaders of this Communist Party movement?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know that warrants were issued chiefly for leaders and officers and persons in responsible positions in those organizations which were formed for the purpose of promoting the revolutionary movement in the United States in their various meetings and organizations. Now, if it be true that some of them were not apprehended, it was because the officers were unable to locate or find them.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Well, I have been informed that men who are in the country to-day, men who are speaking for the Communist Party to-day, were not arrested or apprehended, and no warrants were ever issued for their arrest.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman name some of those leaders?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Louis C. Fraina was the name of one of the leaders that was given to me. I understand he has not been apprehended, but I have no information other than hearsay.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no information as to any particular individual case, but I do know that the Attorney General and those who appeared before the committee positively stated that these warrants of arrest were directed against the officers and responsible leaders of the revolutionary organizations. The Attorney General went at some length into the organization of the Communist and Communist Labor Parties, and into the platforms or teachings of the two parties, in order to show just how they were fomenting trouble and promoting a movement to injure and, if possible, overturn the Government by force and violence, and he stated that warrants were issued against the officers, those in charge of their various meetings and organizations. Now, if it be that some particular leader was not arrested, I have no information concerning it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Now, can the gentleman tell me anything about the fair-price committees working under the Department of Justice here in the District of Columbia? I read the other day that under the auspices of the Department of Justice the fair-price committee had fixed as a fair rate of profit for a retailer upon a pair of shoes selling for about \$12, 33½ or 35 per cent upon the selling price. That would mean at least 50 per cent profit upon the cost of the shoes to the retailer, and that statement, I understand, is true. Now, can it be that, with appropriations going to the Department of Justice for the prevention of profiteering, that department is approving a profit of that kind upon a staple article like a pair of shoes—a nonperishable article, which, if not sold to-day can be sold to-morrow or a year from to-day?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the fair-price committee was simply an organization which was perfected in the various cities of the land for the purpose of assisting the Department of Justice to bear down the high cost of living.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman further knows that a year ago, possibly, the Attorney General requested this Congress to enact certain legislation by way of amendment to the Lever food-control act which would give him the authority to go into the courts and prosecute criminally and put into jail the profiteers who are reaping such enormous profits at the expense of the people of this country, and this Congress for months failed to give him the legislation he asked for—



Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and why should we do that when he O. K's and approves an exorbitant price upon the sale at retail of a pair of shoes such as I have indicated? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, everyone knows that the Attorney General does not approve it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this matter seems to partake of a political aspect as to this appropriation. This question is really not a political question. It ought not to be dealt with by Congress as a political question. The Attorney General of the United States is a fearless officer, and I want to say to you that a man upon whom the reds have made such a vicious attack in trying to kill him is not one that the Congress of the United States ought now to lie down upon when it comes to providing means for the enforcement of the law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is the duty of the Attorney General to execute the law, and it is the duty of the Congress to pass sufficient laws and give him enough money with which to enforce the law and not to criticize him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the Congress would give him more help and less criticism he would make more progress in the reduction of the high cost of living.

The high cost of living has been dragged in as a political issue, and it has been used as a platform upon which to get into office.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman refer to the campaign of 1912?

Mr. McKEOWN. I refer to the campaign of 1918. [Laughter.] It has been used to get into office with. The question of the high cost of living has been made a political issue when every sane man knows that you can not reduce the high cost of living by legislation. The reduction of the high cost of living has got to come by increasing the supply of necessities and the prevention of hoarding.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think, however, that Congress ought to sit silent with the approval by the Department of Justice of a profit of 50 per cent on the cost of a pair of shoes?

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not know whether the gentleman's statement of it is correct—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I can assure the gentleman that it is correct.

Mr. McKEOWN. But Congress is not here to approve or disapprove of the particular amounts or percentages allowed in particular cases without all the facts in the case. But there is this much that I do know, and that is that Congress is interested in bringing shoes within the reach of the people, and that the Attorney General ought to have the money with which to enforce the law, and it is the duty of Congress to give it to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us what law there is now on the statute books to prevent a profit of 50 per cent on shoes?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. He has the Lever food-control act.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way would that enable the Attorney General to stop profiteering on shoes?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It provides for the fixing of a reasonable price, and if he would enforce it we would have something like reasonable prices.

Mr. McKEOWN. Here is the attitude you gentlemen on the Republican side have taken: In one breath you condemn the Attorney General because he does not reduce the high cost of living and in the next you oppose an appropriation to enforce the law. We ought to give him sufficient funds to let him try to the full extent to put the red anarchists out of this country and to put the profiteers in jail, and you ought to give him full authority and plenty of money with which to do it, and not go out to the country and say, "If you put me in power, I will immediately reduce the high cost of living," or go out to the country and say, "You have got an Attorney General who does not enforce the law," when you do not give him the money with which to enforce it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course, the gentleman understands that, as far as deporting reds is concerned, I contend that the \$1,700,000 that the Attorney General proposes to use is as much as can be used with the machinery in the other departments?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand the gentleman from Washington has been all the time advocating the deportation of those people and criticizing one of the other departments because they have not deported them or passed on them for their deportation.

I hold no brief for the Attorney General as to the fair-price committees. I believe in less investigations and more prosecutions.

Give the Attorney General sufficient funds to bring the rich profiteer to the bar of justice and for the apprehension of anarchists in America and if he fails then you can justly criticize him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the Attorney General should have met with some criticism from some sources over the country. Any man who has the duty and responsibility of enforcing penal statutes, or statutes that affect the pocketbooks of the great interests of this country, can expect always to meet with a certain amount of criticism if he does his duty. But I do not think there is anyone who can fairly and justly say that the present Attorney General of the United States has not used his authority and the authority of his department and the appropriations given him by Congress to enforce the laws upon our statute books to the very best of his splendid ability. [Applause.] Gentlemen complain because he has not reduced the price of shoes. I want to ask gentlemen why it is that they have not complied with the request of the President to enact a statute which will give to the Attorney General and to the Department of Justice the power to enforce some of these statutes and to put some of these people in jail and at the same time give publicity to some of these immense profits that are being made, because you will recall that the request has been made of Congress that statutes be enacted providing that the manufacturers' prices of these articles be stamped upon them, so that when the consumer buys them from the retailer he will know exactly what profit is being made. Yet this Congress, in the face of that request of the President, which has been made more than once in the past year, has remained inactive and has failed to take action upon his request. I say it comes with poor grace for us to stand here and undertake to criticize the Attorney General, charged as he is with the duty of enforcing the laws of the United States, and then deny to him the amount of money which he says is necessary to enable him to enforce those laws. On the contrary, it is proposed here to deny him the amount of money that he now has for the enforcement of these laws and to cut down his appropriation for the next year 20 per cent from what was allowed for the current year.

I say that if we do that we are estopped from uttering any criticism of the Attorney General in the future if he should fail in any degree in his efforts to enforce these particular laws.

Gentlemen have asked what the Attorney General has done under the food control act. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MacCRATE] a few moments ago delivered a set speech criticizing the Attorney General for what the gentleman claimed he had failed to do under that act. But in response to a question the gentleman was unable to give the House any information as to the action taken by the Department of Justice.

Mr. MacCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just a moment. I will tell the gentleman what he does not seem to know. As a matter of fact, under that law 1,173 arrests were made, and more than 125 convictions have been secured in various parts of this country. Gentlemen know how difficult it is to secure a conviction in a criminal prosecution when you go before a jury in a man's home town, when you indict some profiteer who stands well in his community, and place him before a jury of 12 men in that particular community. But I submit that the record shows that the Department of Justice, through the district attorneys and agents all over this country, has been vigorous in the prosecution of all those who have been charged with violating that act as well as every criminal statute, and I want to appeal to you now not to cut down the Attorney General's force for next year, but to give him his investigators, give him every special agent he says he needs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a statement showing just what the Department of Justice has done in this direction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

MAY 6, 1920.

In re appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes, fiscal year commencing July 1, 1920.

I understand the fact to be, although I am not certain about it, that as the sundry civil bill now stands the sum of \$2,000,000 has been appropriated for detection and prosecution of crimes.

The expenses of the bureau are now running at a figure of approximately \$3,000,000 per year.



On March 9 I furnished you with a memorandum in which I stated that about \$2,500,000 would be sufficient for the bureau for the next fiscal year. Since that time, however, several things have come to my attention which indicate that such sum will not be sufficient.

The additional facts, exclusive of those bearing upon the question of the high cost of living, may be summarized under two headings:

(A) THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION IS MORE THAN SELF-SUPPORTING.

1. In the Seattle Shipyard case, investigation whereof was commenced at the request of the Shipping Board, 12 men, at an average salary of \$7 per day plus \$4 per day and traveling expenses, were engaged from October 1 to date, at an estimated total expense of around \$30,000. This investigation produced bona fide claims in favor of the Government in civil action amounting to \$415,000 and produced facts upon which the Government is stopping payment of claims already allowed in the additional amount of \$4,240,000. It is anticipated that most, if not all, of this amount will be saved for the Government. The financial results to the United States Government in this case alone more than pays the operation expenses of the Bureau of Investigation for the entire fiscal year. In addition thereto, indictments have been found against 25 or more defendants as a result of this investigation.

2. In another case, the name whereof must remain confidential, inasmuch as indictments have not yet been presented by the grand jury, bona fide claims in favor of the Government in the amount of \$326,000 have been disallowed. It is also expected that a number of indictments will result.

3. In another case of the same nature, and likewise confidential, claims have been disallowed by one of the Government departments in the amount of \$42,000 upon evidence produced by the bureau, and two indictments are expected to follow.

4. In another case \$25,000 in claims were disallowed by another Government department on evidence produced by the bureau.

5. From and after the first of the year the activities of the anti-trust division became revived, although prior to that time they amounted to practically nothing. At present there are 90 antitrust cases proceeding and facts have come to the attention of the department that show that at least 100 more investigations of that nature are awaiting the attention of the bureau. We have 20 special anti-trust agents operating from the bureau whose entire time is taken up in such investigations and the time of at least 20 more with their per diems and traveling expenses are constantly being used to further such investigations. Only a small number of these cases have been brought to a final conclusion as yet, but the amount of fines collected, in addition to the good effect of securing indictments in this class of cases, will amount to a very large figure, certainly more than enough to pay the expenses of the investigations themselves, and it is not impossible that such fines in the total will pay considerable, if not all, of the entire expense of the bureau. In one recent case a fine of \$25,000 was imposed and collected.

6. Investigations of fraudulent claims against the Bureau of War Risk Insurance are now producing an income of in excess of \$1,500 per month. The saving in regards to such frauds by the publicity attending indictments and exposures is probably much greater.

7. Our bank accountants are constantly collecting fines against individuals in addition to the penitentiary sentences they are securing.

8. We have no statistics showing the amount of fines collected in miscellaneous matters upon convictions obtained by the activities of the Bureau of Investigation. One item may be taken as illustrative of the amount recovered. On liquor cases arising under the then existing statutes prior to January 1, 1920, a casual examination of the reports of agents show that \$147,000 was collected in fines. These reports were not made for this purpose and are not at all complete. Mr. Keep, who directs this line of investigation, assures me that it does not represent more than one-half of the total amount of fines collected throughout the United States in liquor cases.

(B) UNANTICIPATED BURDENS UPON THE APPROPRIATION.

1. Legislation enforcing national prohibition did not come into effect until January of this year, and it was some time thereafter that the Treasury Department succeeded in organizing its force so as to deal with this matter without our assistance. A more or less heavy burden, though decreasing burden, has been placed upon the bureau by reason of such fact. There are a large number of liquor investigations that the bureau can not escape. They involve cases wherein the district attorney requests additional help from the bureau in cases which are about to be tried; cases of emergency, where no prohibition agent is available; and cases involving the integrity of the prohibition agents. From this it will be seen that the most important of the prohibition cases are still a burden upon the bureau.

2. As hereinabove stated, the antitrust work has grown beyond any possible expectation due to several factors, among them being the natural profiteering tendency arising subsequent to the war, the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the steel case, and the attitude of the Federal Trade Commission in referring more and more of these cases to the Department of Justice for action. As above stated, there are about 190 cases at present demanding the attention of the department which will involve the activities of about 40 agents for the rest of this year and all of the succeeding fiscal year.

3. The election fraud cases, among them being the famous Newberry case, likewise added a heavy burden. It is estimated that the Newberry case cost the Bureau of Investigation about \$40,000. In this connection, however, I wish to add that fines to the amount of \$45,000 were assessed.

4. The investigation of the Seattle Shipyard produced such good results that the Shipping Board desire like investigations to be made in a number of other cases which it is hoped will produce substantial results, although such investigations will necessarily deplete the bureau's appropriation.

5. The War Department has issued bulletins requesting the public to make report of such violations of the selective-service act as comes to their attention. The regulations authorizing these bulletins are recent in origin and are throwing a heavy burden upon the bureau which could not be anticipated. We have heretofore investigated 200,000 of such cases, 40,000 whereof are shown to have a criminal aspect and indictments are expected. We are obtaining from 15 to 20 convictions a day throughout the United States in this class of cases. I estimate that there will be 100,000 additional of these investigations to be made by the bureau resulting from the action of the War Department.

6. The gradual increase in cost of living has made it necessary for us to meet demands for increased salaries. We have made such in-

creases where possible but our better men are constantly leaving us because of their inability to receive compensation in a Government position commensurate with their ability. It is not uncommon for men to leave our bureau and receive a salary of from two to three times the salary paid by the Government. These increases are, however, an additional burden. The increase in the number of investigations demanding the services of expert accountants and agents well informed on business affairs makes it necessary for us to consider a larger increase in salaries of men engaged in that line of work if we are to keep them in the Government employ. At present rates we are losing our best men. This situation can only be met by giving such men commensurate salaries for such services.

7. The act of Congress making it a crime to transport stolen automobiles across State lines has become to be more of a burden upon the bureau than was anticipated. We have obtained up to date convictions in over 160 of such cases.

8. When the railroads were turned back to private ownership there were a large number of investigations arising out of stolen shipments in interstate commerce. Prior to that time these investigations were made by the railroad police. Since that time, although the investigators of the private lines are of great assistance, there is nevertheless an increased burden upon the bureau of investigation.

9. The appropriations of the War and Navy Departments for investigative purposes having been exhausted, we are under constant pressure to complete investigations they have commenced but are unable to complete or to take up new ones they have been unable to undertake, particularly regarding thefts of Government property in and about camps and shipyards. This was an unanticipated and considerable burden upon the bureau.

10. The expenses of the radical division have continued at their high mark since before the first of the year, and there have been some rather unusual expenses in connection therewith incident to the raids upon the Union of Russian Workers, the Communist Party, and the Communist Labor Party. Upward of 25 per cent of the activities of the bureau are on radical matters. The situation in this regard, however, is not different from what I have anticipated, but is perhaps different from what Congress or the public may understand the facts to be.

11. Congress has recently passed a resolution requesting the investigation of all military camps and cantonments with respect to any fraudulent claims growing out of their construction or otherwise. Several investigations of this nature have been made in the past, including that of the Air Nitrates Corporation at Muscle Shoals. There are 32 such camps and cantonments, and our best estimate, based upon expenses in similar investigations heretofore incurred, would make the cost of the investigation called for by said resolution amount to somewhere around \$3,000,000.

If the bureau is to be expected to go into this thing as the resolution calls for, a special appropriation covering such matters ought to be made by Congress; otherwise we can not be expected to do more than a very small part of such work without seriously interfering with the bureau's other activities.

12. The passport-control act, which extended the powers of the State Department upon the granting of passports and permits to leave the United States, has shown an increase in the requests for information upon individuals concerned from a comparatively few up to the present figure in excess of 2,000 a day. Most of these requests, however, do not require field investigation, but each requires an examination of the files of the bureau. Field investigations, however, are frequently made at the request of the State Department.

13. The fact that we have not yet arrived at peace with the Central Powers of Europe has thrown a very heavy unanticipated burden upon the bureau in making the investigations necessary to recommend the exception from the classification of alien enemy for naturalization purposes. The law does not permit us to make such recommendations until an investigation is made. Every German or Austrian who had previously taken out his first papers and who now desires his second papers is applying to the bureau to have an investigation made so that his naturalization may not be delayed any longer. Over 7,000 of such applications have been made since the first of the year, which is larger than the entire number of such applications made prior thereto. About 2,500 of such investigations have been conducted since the first of the year. It will be remembered that a personal investigation and interview of the applicant and his witnesses and a written report is necessary in every case.

The activities in this regard will cease immediately upon the declaration of peace. However, the time when peace will be declared is problematical, and until such time we will be burdened with at least 3,000 to 4,000 such investigations.

14. The Mexican situation has been an increasing burden upon the bureau, and particularly in view of the fact that for lack of appropriation the Immigration Service along the border has been suspended. It has been necessary for us to increase the number of agents along the Mexican border.

15. I have not included any observation on the high cost of living, which I understand Mr. Figg's organization has covered by a special memorandum. For your information, however, the actual number of reports received from our field agents when distributed show that 15 per cent of such reports are upon cost-of-living investigations. When it is considered that such investigations are necessarily laborious and complicated, it will readily be understood that this percentage does not express the true relation of such activities to the other activities of the bureau. No accurate statistics are available, but the cost-of-living investigations are a burden of approximately 25 per cent of the entire appropriation.

Of course, that proportion that may be expended at the seat of government should bear a correct ratio with that which will be expended in the field. It seems to me that it would not be out of the way to be permitted to expend 10 per cent of the appropriation at Washington, although that may be considered a little bit high in case of a large appropriation, but would not be considered high in case of a small appropriation, because of the disproportionate demands made by Government departments upon the bureau officials at Washington regarding the contents of our confidential files and the well-recognized rule that overhead expense is always larger in proportion where the investment is small.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think we should approach this subject with a full realization of what we have done and what it is proposed to do. The last Congress, a Congress in sympathy politically with the Attorney General, reported out this bill, which carried a similar item of \$1,600,000 for this very



purpose. Later, in the present Congress, the Attorney General made an estimate for a deficiency of a million dollars, and in presenting the matter before the Committee on Appropriations, he said that the money would be expended largely in prosecution of the red element in this country, or running down the reds, and in the prosecution of the profiteers and in reducing the high cost of living. Congress gave him every penny that he asked for—\$1,000,000—more than the last Congress gave him.

Now, I am perfectly willing to appropriate, so far as I am individually concerned, all the money necessary for the Attorney General's office. But I want to make this observation, without any tinge of partisanship: To-day the Attorney General is spending \$1,600,000 which we appropriated for arresting, for deportation, the alien radical element which has found shelter and protection in this country. Over 6,000 warrants have been issued and the arrests amount to approximately 3,500 persons. The persons arrested last January by the Attorney General's office are being tried by the Department of Labor, and in 99 cases almost out of 100, maybe that is putting it too strong, they are being dismissed, and you gentlemen on that side are just as loud in your denunciation of Mr. Post in this regard as anybody on this side. My position is this—that it is a useless waste of money to appropriate money by millions for the Department of Justice to make arrests if nothing is to come of the arrest except to release the person arrested.

Gentlemen say that some of that was appropriated for the arrest of profiteers. I want the profiteer sent to jail, and so we reported every penny that the Attorney General asked for in the deficiency bill. Since then we have seen the commodities and necessities of life mount in price, with all the laws necessary to prevent profiteering on the statute books, all the laws that existed at the time he made the estimate—we have seen sugar go from 10 cents a pound up to 30 cents a pound, and, so far as I know, nobody has gone to jail. I do not know whether they have been arrested or not.

What are the facts? In 1915 all that the Attorney General had for this purpose was \$485,000 and a deficiency of \$25,000. In 1916 he had \$600,000. We appropriate by this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Treasury is depleted, \$2,000,000, which is more than has ever been appropriated before during all the time since the foundation of the Government in a single year, except for this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman said that 99 out of every 100 arrests that were made were dismissed. This record shows that 500 have been taken up.

Mr. GOOD. I said of the last arrests. The gentleman knows that a large number of those were arrested in the first instance, and the Department of Labor did issue the warrants of deportation and, as the gentleman says, about 500 were deported. But I am talking about the arrests that were made on January 1 or thereabouts, and now practically all of the leaders are being released as fast as they come before the Department of Labor.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not the fault of the Attorney General.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not. I have not intended to give that impression. But why appropriate \$500,000 to make arrests of alien anarchists if they are to be released at once. Rather expensive and entirely useless.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not blaming the Attorney General because we have an anarchist in the Department of Labor, who is protecting his brother anarchists. We are responsible for Post's remaining there. We ought to put him out. You are in the majority and you can put him out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were 40 ayes and 47 noes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GOOD and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported 43 ayes and 57 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the office expenses of United States marshals in the District of Alaska, services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise, services in Alaska and Oklahoma in collecting evidence for the United States when so specially directed by the Attorney General, and maintenance, alteration, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles used in connection with the transaction of the official business of the office of United States marshal for the District of Columbia, \$2,061,000. Advances to United States marshals, in accordance with existing law, may be made from the proper appropriations, as herein provided, immediately upon the passage of this act; but no disbursements shall be made prior to July 1, 1920, by said disbursing officers from the funds thus advanced, and no disbursements shall be made therefrom to liquidate expenses for the fiscal year 1920, or prior years: *Provided*, That there shall be paid hereunder any necessary cost of keeping vessels or other property attached or libeled in admiralty in such amounts as the court, on petition setting forth the facts under oath, may allow: *Provided further*, That marshals and office deputy marshals (except in the District of Alaska) may be granted a per diem of not to exceed \$4 and \$3, respectively, in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. In line 21 I move to strike out the words "and \$3, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 21, strike out the words "and \$3, respectively."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. It would not help if he struck out the provision, because the law fixes that and they would not be allowed to pay in excess of the statutory provision. To strike out the words here would avail nothing.

Mr. GANDY. I want to say that my object in offering the amendment is to call attention primarily to the various rates of per diem that are allowed in this and other bills. I think it wrong in practice, not conducive to good business or good administration of affairs to say that one official shall have an allowance for expenses in the field of \$3, that another shall have \$4, another \$5, another \$6, and we have some in this bill up to \$7.

Mr. BLANTON. That has been stricken out.

Mr. GANDY. I am informed that that is stricken out.

Mr. GOOD. The committee was aware of that fact; but the per diem in no instance is sufficient to pay the expenses of these officials, owing to the increase in hotel bills. But the committee did not have jurisdiction of this matter, and it is doubtful if we could have taken the time to have considered the question in all its aspects and reported out a bill that would have been equitable. So we simply made the appropriation in accordance with existing law.

Mr. GANDY. If the appropriation committee has not jurisdiction, I hope that some committee will bring in a bill that will not require an officer of the Government when he is on his official work to go down into his salary for a part of the expenses of the trip.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of United States district attorneys and expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants, including the office expenses of United States district attorneys in Alaska, and for salaries of regularly appointed clerks to United States district attorneys for services rendered during vacancy in the office of the United States district attorney, \$730,000: *Provided*, That United States district attorneys and their regular assistants may be granted a per diem of not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. In some portions of the country, due to extraordinary conditions, it is practically impossible for the United States district attorney to live on the salary that he is paid. I have been told that there is some legislation in view which will permit the Attorney General to increase the salary. Can the gentleman inform me in respect to that?

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman refer to the salary of the assistants?

Mr. PARRISH. No; of the district attorneys. The salary is fixed by law now.

Mr. GOOD. As the gentleman knows, the salary of the district attorney is fixed by law. I think there is a bill pending before the Committee on the Judiciary with regard to the matter, but I am not advised as to what action has been taken on the bill.

Mr. PARRISH. In so far as the assistants are concerned, will the Attorney General have any power to pay to the first assistant district attorney more than he gets now? I understand he now gets \$2,500.

Mr. GOOD. Under the provisions of this paragraph, the Attorney General can pay up to \$3,000. He can not pay to exceed that. He can fix the salary at any amount up to \$3,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Iowa makes the statement that the Attorney General can fix the salary of the assistant district attorney as he pleases up to \$3,000. Of course, that is the language of the law, but there are a great many ways of enforcing and a great many ways of evading laws. A large share of the people in the district attorneys' offices throughout the country are there as special assistants, doing exactly the same work as the regular assistant does.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The regular assistant has a salary limited to \$3,000, but the special assistants have no limitation on their salaries, and they receive a much higher compensation, many of them, than \$3,000 a year. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in answering the question I had in mind only the regular assistants who are provided for in the appropriation of \$500,000, but in the very next paragraph, carrying \$450,000, there is one assistant provided for who is employed at \$9,000, one at \$8,500, one at \$7,500, and several at salaries of \$5,000 or over.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, yes; and those salaries were intended in the first place to be paid to attorneys doing special work, but the Attorney General's office—and I am not criticizing it in this respect—not only is very bright in knowing how to enforce the law, but it is exceedingly bright in knowing how to evade the law. Having a law providing that the regular assistants shall not be paid more than \$3,000, they appoint a regular assistant and call him a special assistant. That is simply an evasion of the law. Perhaps the limitation ought not to be in the law. I do not know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman to say that they have any attorneys called special assistants who are permanently located?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Permanently located in nearly all of the district attorneys' offices.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be in some of the larger offices, like Chicago or New York, but I do not think that applies all over the country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would apply to an office where they have a large amount of work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have a great deal of work in all of these offices.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not say that they do not need them; I am not complaining about that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This appropriation is specially limited to assistants to the Attorney General employed in special cases. I do not see how, under that appropriation, if we are talking about the same appropriation, what the gentleman says is possible.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not referring to any special appropriation, but I am telling a fact.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SANFORD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

On May 3, 1920:

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

On May 5, 1920:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

On May 6, 1920:

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.; and

H. R. 9629. An act for the relief of the Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co.

On May 7, 1920:

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas; and

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River.

On May 8, 1920:

H. R. 13677. An act making appropriations to supply a deficiency in appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12869. An act for the construction of a bridge across the Pentwater River or Pentwater Lake, Mich.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries: Warden, \$4,000; deputy warden, \$2,000; chaplains—1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,200; physician, \$1,800; pharmacist and physician's assistant, \$1,000; chief clerk, \$1,800; record clerk, \$1,200; stenographer, \$900; clerks—1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000, 4 at \$900 each; head cook, \$1,000; steward and storekeeper, \$1,200; superintendent of farm and transportation, \$1,200; 3 captains of watch, at \$1,500 each; guards, \$124,800; 2 teamsters, at \$600 each; engineer and electrician, \$1,500; 2 assistants, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$159,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In a recent deficiency appropriation bill the Committee on Appropriations provided for increasing the pay of guards at Federal penitentiaries by inserting a provision that for the first year of service they should receive \$70 a month, which is the pay they have been receiving a number of years, that for the second year of service they should receive \$80, for the third year \$90, and for the fourth and subsequent years \$100 a month. This became a law on a deficiency bill a couple of months ago, and was entirely just and proper on the part of the committee. However, at these same institutions there is another class of employees—the clerks. There are six clerks, I think, at Leavenworth Penitentiary and about the same number at Atlanta. These clerks are employees who are receiving much less money than was provided for the guards in a recent amendment, although these clerks take a civil-service examination which is of a higher class than the guards. I think they should be paid as high at least as the guard is paid. I understand that the Department of Justice has strongly recommended to the committee that the same provisions, or even stronger provisions, be made with respect to the clerks that have been made for the guards. I think the committee should make a reasonable increase in the pay of these clerks.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How much do the guards receive, as well as the clerks?

Mr. ANTHONY. The guards are now receiving, practically all of them, \$100 a month, though of course there are some new ones who do not receive that.

Mr. BLANTON. Ought they to receive more than the school-teachers of the District of Columbia?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the school-teachers should receive more money.

Mr. BLANTON. But we just turned them down this morning.

Mr. ANTHONY. And I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that the Department of Justice has asked that this provision be made for the clerks. It was my understanding that some provision would be made for them on a deficiency bill. This seems to be the last opportunity you will have to take care of them. Under the law I think they are authorized at \$900 a year. One of them, I think, is getting \$1,200 a year, one of them \$1,000, and four \$900 a year.

Mr. GOOD. They get the bonus.

Mr. ANTHONY. They get the bonus.

Mr. GOOD. One clerk gets \$1,440 and the other \$1,240 and the other four \$1,140 each.

Mr. ANTHONY. I submit that the base of \$3 for a stenographer and clerk is not the amount of pay that is commensurate with the work done by these men and is entirely out of line with the rate of payment that is accorded practically to every occupation in the immediate neighborhood of these institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They get the bonus; have they been in the service over a year—

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the chairman of the committee says they are receiving a bonus, but that is a temporary matter.

Mr. GOOD. They receive it for next year on the legislative bill; that has already been appropriated.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is for one year, and we do not know—

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.



Mr. CALDWELL. If these men are Republicans, I will vote for it. Are they Republicans or Democrats?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think these gentlemen are perhaps divided—

Mr. CALDWELL. Was the gentleman in here the other day when we had up the matter of the cemetery appropriation, where a member of the Republican steering committee opposed it on the ground that they were Democrats?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I did not hear anything of the kind.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman did not vote on that proposition?

Mr. ANTHONY. I was not here.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will tell the gentleman, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman, a member of the steering committee, that 40 out of 41 were registered Republicans.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 129, line 25, after the last semicolon, insert:

"Provided, That from and including July 1, 1920, the salaries of clerks and stenographers shall be as follows:

"For the first year of service, \$75 per month.

"For the second year of service, \$80 per month.

"For the third year of service, \$90 per month.

"For the fourth and subsequent years of service, \$100 per month."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order against it; it is exactly the same provision he himself included in the deficiency bill for this other class of employees.

Mr. GOOD. We put the other item in for the other class of employees to meet a condition that was very serious. Here were guards whom we understood were scarcely men of families, at least that is the character of men that they wanted at a penitentiary for guards. We wanted guards who were good, strong, law-abiding citizens. Now, because they were only paying \$70 a month they could not get that kind of men and were obliged to go out on the street corners and get men to put in there in charge of the penitentiary whom they know nothing about at all, and the situation was so serious the department came and asked for this legislation, and the subcommittee on the deficiency was impressed with the serious condition that confronted these institutions, and we granted that amount. Now, it is true that bill was passed providing for a new scale for guards after the estimates for the sundry civil bill for next year were made up, therefore there was no estimate for guards or for clerks. Since that time the department has made an estimate, just as the gentleman has stated, as I recall, increasing the pay somewhat, I have forgotten what it is, but I will say to the gentleman that when the officials came before the committee they never referred to it. The item not being carried on the work sheet before me, I knew nothing about it and did not know then that they had asked for it, and they never suggested these clerks were of the same character at all.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman, of course, remembers there were hearings before the committee, and will remember at one of the hearings I appeared, and from the hearing it is evident that the gentleman from Georgia also appeared—

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. And made some presentation to the committee.

Mr. GOOD. That was a month after we had heard the Department of Justice.

Mr. ANTHONY. And I find upon inquiry of the Department of Justice to-day they say that they have for some months recommended that to take care of these people.

Mr. GOOD. They forwarded an estimate for that purpose. It is true the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] appeared for these clerks. The gentleman spoke very forcefully for these clerks and the committee was impressed with the situation; but, after all, the same serious situation does not confront us concerning these clerks that confronted the penitentiary in regard to guards.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will yield right there. The only reason he was not confronted with the same situation is because these clerks are nearly all old employees of the Government. They are men who have been with the Government some 10, 12, and 16 years, and most of them were former guards and for the reason they are fixed in their places, and otherwise they probably would leave the Government service and—

Mr. GOOD. The lower paid clerks will get \$1,140.

Mr. ANTHONY. With the bonus?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is their pay.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is Congress going to continue that?

Mr. GOOD. It is for the next year; it has already been voted upon. I hope the gentleman will not press this. I knew nothing about it except the gentleman's statement, and I do not believe the gentleman believes these clerks are on the same level with the work of the guards. Besides, we must remember that we are not granting other increases to clerks of this class anywhere.

Mr. ANTHONY. Certainly, just exactly; and these clerks were formerly—

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman over there, but I must ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANTHONY. It seems to me the amendment offered is along the line of simply increasing the pay of the clerks and is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. It changes existing law, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment seeks to establish the salaries of clerks and stenographers at the Leavenworth Penitentiary permanently, and therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clothing, transportation, and traveling expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., \$90,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I want to ask him if the committee went thoroughly into these general appropriations for the support of these penitentiaries with the idea of determining whether the appropriations for subsistence and maintenance were sufficient or not, or has the committee arbitrarily cut the appropriations down to a figure they deem proper?

Mr. GOOD. The committee has made some cuts. For instance, for the subsistence at Atlanta we cut only \$10,000. The department asked for \$175,000 and we gave them \$165,000, and they are getting along this year with \$150,000. We went into the matter somewhat. It is costing a little more—

Mr. ANTHONY. The reason I ask the question is that for the last two years large deficiencies have been brought in under these heads, and I understand under the appropriations which were made last year that many of the firms who furnished supplies under the contracts which were let in accordance with these appropriations have had to wait nine months for their pay from the Government after the delivery of goods and supplies, and some of them have not been paid yet, because of the large deficiencies which were created, and which the Congress has failed to appropriate for and take care of. And it struck me that was not a proper businesslike basis for conducting the affairs of these big institutions.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it was not. We are confronted with this situation, namely, that at Leavenworth they are building a new wing for the penitentiary and will have it ready for occupancy before the end of the year. They have enlarged the penitentiary at Atlanta, and at McNeils Island they have also enlarged the building. We carry in the provision \$870,000 for support of prisoners that are mostly confined in State and county jails, and if that policy is reversed and the penitentiaries are filled to their limit, necessarily there will have to be larger appropriations for their subsistence. If, on the other hand, they do not add materially to the number, I think the appropriation will be sufficient.

Mr. ANTHONY. The point I make is this: If business firms who contract to furnish supplies to these institutions have to wait for nine months or a year, it is going to cost more money.

Mr. GOOD. We have had deficiency bills every four or five months in the last five years, and there never has been a time when one of these deficiency bills failed to provide the money to take care of any legitimate claim against the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is it possible, then, that the Department of Justice is hiding the real expenditure for these institutions in asking for the correct appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know.

Mr. ANTHONY. I know that these deficiencies exist, because officials have told me they do.

Mr. GOOD. At Atlanta, as I recall now, they might need a little more by the end of the year. They had \$150,000, and certainly everybody up to date who has furnished anything for that penitentiary has had his money or the money is available. I think the same thing is true at Leavenworth. They have plenty of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Training School for Boys, \$67,536.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa how many boys are in this institution at this time? Does he know?

Mr. GOOD. It is my recollection that there are 406 boys there.

Mr. BEE. Is ample provision being made for taking care of industry for them, so that when they come out of the institution they are worth while?

Mr. GOOD. They are given a course in manual training.

Mr. BEE. The reason I asked was that a young man from my city was sent to this institution, and when he came back I was surprised—the Federal judge having stated that he would come out with a trade—that he did not have the training that enabled him to go into anything definite at that time.

Mr. GOOD. They teach brick making and carpentry, and especially farming. The institution is located about 3 or 4 miles out of Washington. They have 230 or 240 acres of land, and to the extent that the institution is equipped to give manual training, they do give it to the boys there.

Mr. BEE. I consider it one of the best institutions in the country, and I hoped they were making ample provision.

Mr. GOOD. It is a very good institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.  
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

General expenses: For supplies, repairs, maintenance, and incidental expenses of lighthouses and other lights, beacons, buoyage, fog signals, lighting of rivers heretofore authorized to be lighted, light vessels, other aids to navigation, and lighthouse tenders, including the establishment, repair, and improvement of beacons and day marks and purchase of land for same; establishment of post lights, buoys, submarine signals, and fog signals; establishment of oil or carbide houses, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That any oil or carbide house erected hereunder shall not exceed \$550 in cost; construction of necessary out-buildings at a cost not exceeding \$500 at any one light station in any fiscal year; improvement of grounds and buildings connected with light stations and depots; restoring light stations and depots and buildings connected therewith: *Provided*, That such restoration shall be limited to the original purpose of the structures; wages of persons attending post lights; temporary employees, and field force while engaged on works of general repair and maintenance, and laborers and mechanics at lighthouse depots; rations and provisions or commutation thereof for keepers of lighthouses, working parties in the field, officers and crews of light vessels and tenders, and officials and other authorized persons of the Lighthouse Service on duty on board of such tenders or vessels, and money accruing from commutation for rations and provisions for the above-named persons on board of tenders and light vessels or in working parties in the field may be paid on proper vouchers to the person having charge of the mess of such vessel or party; reimbursement under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce of keepers of light stations and masters of light vessels and of lighthouse tenders for rations and provisions and clothing furnished shipwrecked persons who may be temporarily provided for by them, not exceeding in all \$5,000 in any fiscal year; fuel and rent of quarters where necessary for keepers of lighthouses; purchase of land sites for fog signals; rent of necessary ground for all such lights and beacons as are for temporary use or to mark changeable channels and which in consequence can not be made permanent; rent of offices, depots, and wharves; traveling expenses; mileage; library books for light stations and vessels, and technical books and periodicals not exceeding \$1,000; traveling and subsistence expenses of teachers while actually employed by States or private persons to instruct the children of keepers of lighthouses; all other contingent expenses of district offices and depots; and not exceeding \$8,500 for contingent expenses of the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses in the District of Columbia, \$4,200,000.

Hereafter post-lantern lights and other aids to navigation may be established and maintained, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, on the Yukon River and its tributaries, Alaska. The cost thereof shall be paid out of the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service.

Keepers of lighthouses: For salaries of not exceeding 1,800 lighthouse and fog-signal keepers and persons attending lights exclusive of post lights, \$1,300,000.

Lighthouse vessels: For salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders, including temporary employment when necessary, \$1,800,000.

Superintendents, clerks, etc.: For salaries of 17 superintendents of lighthouses, and of clerks and other authorized permanent employees in the district offices and depots of the Lighthouse Service, exclusive of those regularly employed in the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses, District of Columbia, \$400,000.

For retired pay of officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices and shops, \$70,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in this section of the bill that the appropriation is a lump-sum appropriation for a number of purposes in connection with the Lighthouse Bureau of the Department of Commerce, and I notice among those items one for fog signals. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if in the appropriation which is allowed for this bureau there is a sufficient amount to take care of the emergency needs or recommendations with respect to those signals, which are now particularly important when we are developing such an enormous merchant marine, and when it is highly essential that in the ports of this country adequate safeguards should be given to shipping to protect it in times of fog as well as on other occasions?

Mr. GOOD. I think so.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have in mind the recommendation of the Department of Commerce for the establishment of a fog signal at the port of Galveston. Through that harbor passes the commerce which not only goes through the port of Galveston but Texas City, Port Bolivar, and Houston as well.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Do they not have a fog signal there?

Mr. BRIGGS. They do not; and they have made recommendations for a fog signal at \$6,500.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This will not provide fog signals.

Mr. GOOD. They can purchase one.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no; they can not. Fog signals are provided for by special legislation. All this is is an appropriation for aids to navigation. I think there is a bill coming up shortly—I do not think it ought to come up—providing for additional aids to navigation.

I served for many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as chairman of a subcommittee dealing with new aids to navigation. If there is any really important place in the United States that has not got some aid to navigation, or any important place that has not got a light or fog signal, I do not know where it is.

Mr. BRIGGS. They have lights, and this is probably the greatest cotton port in the world. They ship more cotton from there than from any other port in the world.

Mr. GOOD. I think they have authority to place a fog signal there.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I do not think so. We pass special bills in reference to this matter—general acts, of course—providing for new aids to navigation in various places, and providing what they shall be; but in nearly every place where they have a light and can use a fog signal they have a fog signal in connection with it.

Mr. BRIGGS. They have some provision whereby they erected a light on the end of this south jetty, for instance, which projects out into the ocean about six and a half miles from the port of Galveston. It is one of the revetments there that assists in making the harbor and deepening the channel.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Lighthouse Board recommends in its annual report every year the establishment of new aids to navigation. Those recommendations go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is a leading light. They have reported a bill taking in, I suppose, the cases that are most needed. I do not remember what they are. I think that bill is still pending. It is likely to be called up when that committee is reached on a Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does that bill carry an appropriation as well as just an authorization?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Just the authorization.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understood the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to state that, in any event, this appropriation carries sufficient money to meet the needs of that department with respect to these aids to navigation. Is that correct, I will ask the chairman?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that an estimate was made by the department, and my answer is based upon that. When the department estimated that it needed \$6,500 for improving Galveston Jetty Light Station, I assumed, of course, that there was a light station there and that that light station has been established by law. If not, how could they improve one not established and built?

Mr. BRIGGS. They have a light station there.

Mr. GOOD. And when they asked for \$6,500, without saying just what it was for, of course I assumed that they would spend it for the purposes for which they were making the estimate.

Mr. BRIGGS. There is a light station there.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and there being a light station there, I will say to the gentleman that they could buy a fog signal out of this appropriation just as quickly as they could out of an appropriation of \$6,500 that did not describe a fog signal.

Mr. BRIGGS. So that this does carry that item in this bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know what they will do. When these aids are established they are established as light stations, or light and fog-signal stations, specifically naming what they are to be; and if the department spends money in a way not authorized, it is violating the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, I do not know that the department will do this work. What we have done is to give \$4,200,000 as against the regular appropriation of \$3,500,000 last year, and



then \$500,000 to take care of considerable damage that was done to the Lighthouse Service during the year. Now, we have carried \$200,000 more than the total appropriation for this year, an amount ample to take care of the very needy projects; and if this is one of the very needy projects in the opinion of the Lighthouse Service, and if it is authorized, then the service will have the money to do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAND: Page 135, line 7, after the word "Columbia," strike out "\$4,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,300,000."

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment is introduced by me at the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE], who is interested in this paragraph of the bill. I am informed at his office that this proposed increase of \$100,000, making the appropriation \$4,300,000, is in accordance with the estimate furnished by the department to the committee, which reduced the estimate from \$4,300,000 to \$4,200,000.

The gentleman from Florida is interested in this increase, as is the whole State of Florida, on account of the imperfections of its water front. He is absent unavoidably, and at his request I have introduced this amendment and submit it to the committee with the hope that it will be given proper consideration and passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BRAND. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 13, yeas 19.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to transfer, under such rules and regulations as he may deem advisable, to educational institutions and to museums such instrument of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey as, in his judgment, are of historical value, but of no further use in the work of that survey, except such historical instruments as may be needed by the Smithsonian Institution for exhibit at the National Museum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, on page 142, line 21, I move to strike out the word "instrument" and insert the word "instruments."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yes Bay (Alaska) Hatchery: Superintendent, \$1,500; foreman, \$1,200; two fish-culturists, at \$900 each; three apprentice fish-culturists, at \$900 each; cook, \$900; in all, \$8,220.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER. I do so, Mr. Chairman, in order to ask a question in regard to Yes Bay hatchery. I believe there were some items eliminated from that Yes Bay estimate for the scientific propagation of fish.

Mr. GOOD. They have for the current year \$8,220. We gave them just exactly what they have this year.

Mr. MILLER. Was not their appropriation asked for some special purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they asked that the salary of the superintendent be increased from \$1,500 to \$2,000, that of the foreman from \$1,200 to \$1,500, and the salaries of the two fish culturists from \$900 to \$1,200 each. The committee did just what it did in all the other cases, left those salaries just as they are at present. They asked the same increases in all the other stations practically, and the committee denied the increases.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, equipment, and operations of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment and apparatus, contingent expenses, temporary labor, and not to exceed \$10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith, \$400,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is there any provision, and if so where, for the maintenance of what they call rescue stations? I know they have them on the Mississippi River. The river overflows and a great many fish come out of the river and get into the low places, and then the water recedes and they are left there, and in the course of a month or so the water dries up and the fish are destroyed. The department have what they call rescue stations, and they get tens of thousands, and I suppose, millions of fish out of the borrow pits and other holes where the water remains for a while. That is a very important activity. I could not locate the appropriation for it in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. I suppose that is paid for out of the appropriation carried on page 151, commencing with line 18, if the work is not done at some of the permanent stations. At Homer, Minn., there is one of these rescue stations, and I am familiar with the work that is being done, as most of the Members are, because streams are being supplied with fish now from these rescue stations. I think some of that rescue work is done by launches and other vessels that are maintained by the bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I know they have these rescue stations in my district, and they do a great deal of good. They save many thousands of fish. I was wondering if those rescue stations were being taken care of. They ought to be.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. They have the same money for next year as they have for this year. We have not eliminated any appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman feels confident that they are being provided for in some of these appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. If the work is not done at stations for which specific appropriations are made, it is paid for out of one of the lump sums provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inquiry respecting food fishes: For inquiry into the causes of the decrease of food fishes in the waters of the United States, the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries, and for investigation and experiments in respect to the aquatic animals, plants, and waters, in the interests of fish culture and the fishery industries, including expenses of travel and preparation of reports, \$45,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, on page 152, line 7, I move to strike out the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 152, line 7, after the word "States," strike out "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this at the request of the bureau. The committee in framing the bill felt that this sentence should appear in this paragraph instead of the paragraph that follows. The paragraph that follows is a paragraph dealing with statistical inquiries only, to provide for statistics with regard to fisheries, and it seemed to us that the scientific work ought to be performed in the division appropriated for in this paragraph, and the statistical division confined to pure statistics; but for some reason or other for a number of years this statistical bureau has had saddled upon it some scientific work, and the department claims that it will be seriously hampered if we change the mode. So if this amendment is agreed to I propose to offer an amendment to insert in the next paragraph the language stricken out of this paragraph. We can try it another year, but sooner or later some one will make an adjustment in the interest of economy along this line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Statistical inquiry: For collections and compilation of statistics of the fisheries, including travel and preparation of reports, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, \$5,500.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, after the word "fisheries," the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries," and I also move to strike out the figures "\$5,500," in line 15, and insert the figures "\$7,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 152, line 13, after the word "fisheries," insert the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries," and in line 15 strike out "\$5,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500."

Mr. LAYTON. Is the gentleman increasing the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Two thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman if there is any provision in the bill for the repair of fish hatcheries?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; on page 151, beginning with line 4, is an appropriation for maintenance and equipment.

Mr. MILLER. That would include repairs of fish hatcheries?

Mr. GOOD. The ordinary repairs as far as maintenance is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the gentleman another question. Referring back to page 150, line 1, in reference to Yes Bay, was not there an appropriation asked for by the Department of Commerce of \$15,000 and one for \$60,000?

Mr. GOOD. I have a letter from the head of the bureau, but it does not ask for any special appropriation for repairs of that station, but states that they could make the needed repairs out of the regular appropriation.

Mr. MILLER. What is the regular appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Four hundred thousand dollars; that is used in all the fisheries. Of course, if we carried an independent item for each station, this lump sum of \$400,000 would be unnecessary.

Mr. MILLER. My casual reading of the item would not carry with it the right to make repairs.

Mr. GOOD. The commissioner wrote me, under date of April 9, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF FISHERIES,  
Washington, April 9, 1920.

HON. JAMES W. GOOD,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The governor of Alaska has sent to this office your letter to him, dated April 7, regarding an appropriation for repairs at the salmon hatchery at Yes Bay, Alaska.

Permit me to state that no special estimate for this purpose is before your committee. The hatchery is important, and the repairs are urgently needed, but we expect to be able to make them out of our general appropriation.

Respectfully, yours,

H. M. SMITH, Commissioner.

Mr. MILLER. I have a number of telegrams from the Association of Pacific Fisheries regarding Yes Bay, in which they urgently ask that the appropriation be continued.

Mr. GOOD. It is continued.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska, general service: For protecting the seal fisheries of Alaska, including the furnishing of food, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life to the natives of the Pribilof Islands of Alaska, transportation of supplies to and from the islands, expenses of travel of agents and other employees and subsistence while on said islands, hire and maintenance of vessels, and for all expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved April 21, 1910, entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," and for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, including travel, hire of boats, employment of temporary labor, and all other necessary expenses therewith, \$140,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert after the word "expenses," page 153, line 9, the word "connected."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 153, line 9, after the word "expenses," insert "connected."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman how many natives on the Pribilof Islands the Government supplies with food and clothing?

Mr. GOOD. Not very many. Since the flu epidemic a number of native children were left orphans in Alaska. It is necessary to provide food and clothing for them. There are not very many. My collection is about 200.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, with permission of the gentleman I will say that most of that expenditure is repaid. In the main these are sums paid for supplies furnished the natives who have to do with the killing and skinning of the seals and the care of the whole herd.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. I was thinking of another item regarding care of the natives.

Mr. WATSON. Has the chairman an estimate of the value of the furs?

Mr. GOOD. The receipts on account of furs during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, amounted to \$1,282,000.

Mr. WATSON. That is for all Alaska?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. And \$150,000 protects over a million dollars, which is the value of the annual sale of seal furs?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; much more than that. That is about the annual crop. Of course, the seal herd belongs to the United States.

Mr. WATSON. But I wanted to know the value of the furs protected by this appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. The skins that year amounted to \$1,182,000, and we are only killing a limited amount.

Mr. WATSON. Is there a closed season?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they are allowed to kill only a certain number of seals. The law specifically fixes that.

Mr. WATSON. Are the natives employed by the Government?

Mr. GOOD. They are.

Mr. WATSON. And, of course, paid by the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Testing of large scales: For investigation and testing of railroad track scales, elevator scales, and other scales used in weighing commodities for interstate shipments and to secure equipment and assistance for testing the scales used by the Government in its transactions with the public, such as post-office, navy-yard, and customhouse scales, and for the purpose of cooperating with the States in securing uniformity in the weights and measures laws and in the methods of inspection, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract-labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," and acts amendatory thereof; necessary supplies, including exchange of typewriting machines, alterations, and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax and maintenance bills upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That the purchase, use, maintenance, and operation of horse and motor vehicles required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than \$12,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 157, line 8, after the figures "\$2,600,000," insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor in the expenditure of said sum shall allot to the Commissioner General of Immigration for maintaining a border patrol guard, to guard the border between the United States and Mexico, against the unlawful entry of aliens and undesirable persons into the United States, such amounts as will enable the Commissioner General of Immigration to perform adequately the duties authorized by law as to the exclusion of such aliens and undesirable persons."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the chairman of the committee that I am not endeavoring to add to the appropriation, but merely ask that an adequate sum out of \$2,600,000 be allotted to the Director General of Immigration for the purpose of enforcing the law now in existence. I will state to the Members of the House that a hearing was had and my resolution was reported, and I want to read a part of the testimony of the supervising inspector, Mr. Berkshire, who was on the witness stand for two days, I believe, before the Committee on Immigration. This gentleman is now stationed and has been for 14 years in my home city of El Paso as supervising inspector, and he testified as to the need for reenforcing the border patrol, which was established by law two years ago. President Wilson, out of the fund voted to him by this Congress of \$100,000,000 for the enforcement of law, granted \$500,000 for this border patrol. Mr. Berkshire testified as follows:

Mr. BAKER. Well, with the ease with which they can cross and with no guards to prevent them, it has been known that there has been a very fair sum paid for the landing of each Japanese or Chinese that crosses; has that not been a fact within the last few years?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Yes; that is one of the big problems of the border.



Mr. RAKER. Then, as a matter of fact, the Government of the United States, for the want of an appropriation, has practically left down, and now leaves down, the bars between the United States and Mexico to permit undesirable—Mexicans, Chinese, and Japanese—to enter the United States.

Mr. BERKSHIRE. That is the situation, in a few words.

Mr. RAKER. Diseased or otherwise; containing infectious diseases as well as being otherwise undesirable.

Mr. BERKSHIRE. There is practically nothing to prevent them from coming in if they so desire.

Mr. SIEGEL. At the place where you are stationed, how many physicians have you for the purpose of examining immigrants?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Well, we have one or more physicians at every station; we have a sufficient number of physicians to examine—

Mr. SIEGEL (interposing). How many to examine each immigrant?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Only one.

Mr. SIEGEL. And that is done under special order?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. The Public Health Service supplies the medical officer for any station we may have; it depends on how many we require.

That is a part of the testimony of this gentleman who was the supervising inspector on the border for a distance of 2,000 miles. Since this border patrol was taken off, his testimony goes on to state, hundreds and thousands of Japanese, undesirable Mexicans, and Chinese have crossed the border at will. I was interested in a discussion which took place a few moments ago relative to raising the appropriation for the Attorney General's Department. I want to state that unless the border patrol is put back to its original strength, you will have to still further increase the appropriation for the Attorney General's Department to enforce the law and keep out these undesirable Chinese, Japanese, and Mexicans who are coming across in that rough country, where, as Mr. Berkshire states, they have only a sufficient amount of men at the regular immigration stations. It is just a question of whether or not the Members of this House want the law enforced against undesirable aliens. I would say to you that if the conditions described by Mr. Berkshire and other immigration officials continues on that border we will be overrun in two years with undesirable aliens—Japanese, Chinese, and Mexicans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the Secretary of Labor at will can lift the provisions in regard to the literacy test and the head tax and let Mexicans come in, why have a border patrol?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Simply to keep out the undesirables.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And also, if as the testimony shows, when they had this border patrol wet backs came in by swimming the river by the hundreds?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to state to the gentleman that the testimony does not show that condition. It shows a condition after the border patrol was taken off, and that then the wet backs, the graybacks, and the bluebacks came across the river. That was after the border patrol was taken off. If you want the immigration law enforced, then vote for this amendment so that the border patrol can be reinstated.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When was this border patrol reduced in number?

Mr. HUDSPETH. About a year ago, as I recall now. I will state to the gentleman from Kansas that these men in the border patrol are men who were inured to the hardships of the border, men who understood the conditions there, who could ride those trails and who knew the trails where these people were likely to come across. To-day we have men enough only at the regular stations, and that is the reason we are flooded with Japanese and Chinese.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I do not care to raise any question of order if this is the regular patrol that is authorized by law.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. Then I do not quite understand the purport of the gentleman's amendment. The department has all of the money necessary. What the gentleman is asking, then, is practically that the Secretary of Labor shall perform the duties prescribed by law in this respect.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What I am asking is that upon the request of the Director General of Immigration he is allowed a sufficient fund to reestablish the border patrol. He wants the authority of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. But we have a law now to that effect.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is true.

Mr. GOOD. We appropriate money in a lump sum, and it is the duty of the Secretary of Labor to allot a sufficient amount of money to make effective that patrol.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is to simply emphasize the matter. He could do it without this amendment if he had this money, but

it is simply emphasizing the fact that Congress desires the immigration laws of the country enforced and that men who are capable and efficient be placed down on that border of 2,000 miles.

Mr. GOOD. I assume the Secretary of Labor—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Now, suppose the Commissioner of Immigration should ask the Secretary of Labor to allot him \$100,000 for this purpose, or any sum, and suppose the Secretary of Labor should say that it is not necessary to allot over \$25,000. Now, the expenditure of the funds being within the control of the Secretary of Labor, after all it does not seem to me that we are getting very far by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It does to me.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of Labor can then allot the amount which, in his judgment, is sufficient to bring about an effective control, and he has that right now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We had the same law relative to custom officials, and yet my colleague from Texas a few days ago introduced a similar amendment providing sufficient funds to emphasize the fact that it is needed.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and the gentleman's colleague virtually admitted that that did not get anywhere except to tell an official of the Government to do what the law required him to do.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am candid to say that that is all we are telling him by this amendment—that is all—emphasizing the fact that a border patrol is needed and that he should allot sufficient funds out of the \$2,600,000 to reestablish the board of patrol to its former strength to prevent these undesirables from coming across.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I renew it. May we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Now, I would like to state to the gentleman from Illinois that this is not increasing this appropriation. It is simply establishing a border patrol that is authorized by law, and the testimony, as I have just read—the gentleman was not in the Chamber—by the supervising inspector is that the border there, 2,000 miles in length, is now left unprotected, so that Japanese, Chinese, and undesirable aliens are coming in at their will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much will this take of this \$2,600,000?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much does the gentleman estimate that it will take of this?

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman heard the testimony of Mr. Berkshire, who stated it would take about \$250,000. The gentleman remembers that testimony as well as I do.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Would this keep Texas and Arizona from bringing over people to work on the farms?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Not at all. They bring them through the regular immigration stations. This keeps, I will say to the gentleman, these people from entering surreptitiously through these passes, through that rough country, and I do not think any gentleman here would object to it after it has been explained.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that where we make a lump-sum appropriation of this sort we should by an amendment direct a Secretary how it shall be expended. It has to be taken from somewhere else if it is to be expended here.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The same amendment was offered by my colleague, the dean of the Texas delegation, with reference to customs officials a few days ago, and the gentleman withdrew the point of order. It was just identical—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That shows that I erred the other day and one error is not sufficient reason for two. I ought to have insisted on the point of order the other day so it would not be a precedent.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman should not be partial to an older Member as against a new Member who comes here and tries to have the laws enforced.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, it is not our duty to enforce the laws, it is our duty to enact the laws. I do not think it is in order to—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, the Secretary now has the jurisdiction. This is directing the Secretary how he shall allot the money. That is legislation, not an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment in the form in which it is now is an affirmative direction to the Secretary of Labor in respect to the use of the money appropriated by the section, that in the form in which it is now offered it is not a limitation and therefore sustains the point of order.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Washington addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's discussion ought to be made while a fuller membership is here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman objects, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a House full here or we ought to quit. I therefore make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 13590. An act granting the consent of Congress to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., for the construction of a bridge across the Red River between the counties of Fannin, Tex., and Bryan, Okla.;

H. R. 13724. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 11, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 351) extending the provisions of an act amending section 32 of the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, to June 30, 1921, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 952), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14021) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 953), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 412) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the list of chief machinists, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, Pay Corps, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 954), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1447) to correct the naval record of Fred C. Konrad, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 955), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Matthew McDonald, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 956), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14020) to amend public, No. 254, Sixty-fifth Congress, being an act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and known as the revenue act of 1919, by increasing the personal exemption of the heads of families or married persons with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 14021) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 14022) to amend chapter 213, Twenty-fourth Statutes at Large; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14023) to amend section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 551) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives regarding the West Point Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 552) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 13931; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PLATT: Resolution (H. Res. 553) for the consideration of House joint resolution 351; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 554) providing for the consideration of House bill 4438; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 555) providing for the printing of a study entitled "Scots and Scottish Influence in Congress" as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 14024) granting a pension to Julia A. Twichell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 14025) for the relief of Cataldo Bellanova; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14026) granting a pension to Mary A. Flick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3534. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of New Orleans Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the establishment of a Coast Guard station on Lake Pontchartrain at West End, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3535. Also (by request), petition of post-office employees of North Adams, Mass., favoring the immediate enactment of the



civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3536. Also (by request), petition of North Washington Teachers' Association, Washington, D. C., favoring a bonus of not less than \$500 for teachers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3537. Also (by request), petition of Davenport Aerie, No. 235, Fraternal Order of Eagles, regarding the Rock Island Arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3538. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, relative to second-class postage rates, Federal taxation, and Pacific radio services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3539. Also, petition of College of the City of New York Post, American Legion, opposing bonus to noninjured veterans of the war, but in favor of adjusted compensation for those injured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3540. Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, relative to increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3541. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, opposing sales tax on grain or produce for future delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3542. Also, petition of the Disabled Men's Bureau of Service and Legislation, relative to bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3543. Also, petition of Joint Postal Organization, of Boston, Mass., relative to the Postal Service and necessity of the reclassification of postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3544. Also, petition of American Steamship Owners' Association, favoring the granting to the Coast Guard Service the rank and pay of officers of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3545. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring action of Joint Congressional Commission on Postal Salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3546. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of the adjutant general of the National Guard of the State of Alabama, urging the conferees on the Army reorganization bill to act favorably on the bill allowing the National Guard to organize under the militia clauses (State rights); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3547. Also, petition of a mass meeting of citizens of Jefferson County, Ala., favoring the freedom of Ireland and the passage of the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3548. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Sylvester F. Bau, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on stock exchange transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3549. Also, petition of Joint Postal Organizations of Boston, Mass., urging a report of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries and increased remuneration for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3550. Also, petition of the Madison Club of the eighteenth assembly district, urging an early report of the Joint Commission on the Readjustment of Salaries in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3551. Also, petition of Robert L. Cohn, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on stock-exchange transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3552. Also, petition of Gilbert T. Washburn & Co., protesting against legislation taxing advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3553. Also, petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, Washington, D. C., relative to bonus for soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3554. By Mr. PAIGE: Papers to accompany H. R. 14024, granting a pension to Julia A. Twichell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3555. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Albert Firman and Andrew O. Murphy, favoring an increase in pay to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3556. Also, petition of American Museum of Natural History, opposing passage of House bill 12466; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3557. Also, petition of International Planters' Corporation, Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, Morris Land & Improvement Co., Francis S. Whitten, F. Robertson Jones, and Adolph Lewisohn, in connection with soldier-bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3558. Also, petition of American Steamship Owners' Association of New York, favoring the same pay for Coast Guard Service as the officers of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3559. Also, petition of James C. McMullin, of New York City, regarding freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3560. Also, petition of Douglas Johnson, of New York City, regarding freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3561. Also, petition of J. Mitchel Thorsen, Gilbert T. Washburn & Co., and George A. Torsey, opposing the proposed tax on advertising and the proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3562. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Woman's Study Club of Alamo, N. Dak., indorsing the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3563. Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Amidon and the Woman's Study Club of Alamo, both in the State of North Dakota, indorsing the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

3564. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Joint Postal Organization of Boston, Mass., requesting increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 11, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with every mention of Thy name we come to the point of the supreme choice of life. Thou dost bring us to the issue of life by the revelations of Thyself to men. We pray that as we begin the duties of this day, lifting our hearts to Thy throne, our choice may be the choice of God's will and of God's way. May we surrender ourselves fully into Thy keeping, that we may to-day guard the honor of God and advance the interests of Thy kingdom through our work. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2448) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of the Sunday School of the Church of the Brethren, of Waterloo, Iowa, remonstrating against compulsory military training and praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Me., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of Mason County Pomona Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ludington, Mich., and a petition of Hamlin Resort Grange, No. 1354, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ludington, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to farmers the right of collective bargaining, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of Phillip Elliott Hodges Post, No. 22, American Legion, of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing adjusted compensation to ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs, of Oakland County, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Port Huron, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the public protection of maternity and infancy, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 535) thereon.